

THE RUIN THAT BRITAIN WROUGHT

K. M. MUNSHI

THE RUIN
THAT BRITAIN WROUGHT

PUBLISHED FOR
BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN
BY
PADMA PUBLICATIONS LTD
BOMBAY

Rs. 2/8/-

CONTENTS

I. INDIA HUNTERS FOR SWARAJ	1
After a Century and Half	2
Industries Destroyed	3
Spoils of the Plunder	4
II. ROBBED OF COMMERCE, TRADE AND SHIPPING	6
Building Britain on India's Grave	7
Trade Flow Reserved	8
India's Shipping Eliminated	10
The "Divine" Dispensation	12
III. FROM PLENTY TO POVERTY UNPARALLELED	15
Contrasts in Incomes	16
Manipulation of Exchange	17
IV. IMPERIALIST WARS AT INDIA'S EXPENSE	19
Armed forces for Britain's Benefit	20
In the name of Defence	21
Oppressive Taxation	22
The Military: White Elephant	23
The Sterling Balances	25
V. THE DEATH GRIP OF INFLATION	27
Increasing Indebtedness	30
Soaring Prices	31
Black Markets	32
Currency Jugglery	33
VI. THE POVERTY WHICH BRITAIN WROUGHT	35
Everything except self-Rule	40
VII. AGRICULTURE IN RUINS	42
Declining Acreage	42
Village Economy Undermined	45
Decreasing Fertility	46
Diminishing Food Supply	49
The Bengal Famine	50

VIII. DEPLETION OF VITAL NECESSITIES	..	51
Decline in Food Production	..	51
Arrested Developments	..	53
Inadequate and Ill-balanced Diet	..	55
Worse Than Convicts	..	57
IX. THE POPULATION MYTH	..	59
Over-burdened land	..	61
U.S.S.R. with self-Rule	..	63
India kept 150 years behind	..	64
Shortages all round	..	64
Half Naked India	..	65
X. RACE DETERIORATION	..	68
Death Rate	..	68
Infant Mortality	..	69
Maternal Mortality	..	70
In Tippu's Times	..	71
Preventible Diseases	..	72
XI. THE DESCENT OF DARKNESS	..	76
No money for Education	..	78
Education in Russia	..	81
Hunger and Why	..	83

INDIA HUNTERS FOR SWARAJ

There is a hunger for Swaraj. That hunger growing, growing till the stage where satisfaction cannot be denied.

This hunger is not a matter of sentiment, not even the handiwork of, what at one time were dubbed, pestilential agitators. It is the work of the British. They came to this land a hundred and seventy-five years ago. They mastered it, controlled it, dealt with it—for their own good. They destroyed its industry, drained away its resources, kept it under-developed, under-nourished backward—in their own interests. In the trial of Warren Hastings, Sheridan thus charged his people:

“If my Lords, a stranger had at this time entered the province of Oude, ignorant of what had happened since the death of Sujah Dowlah—the prince who with a savage heart and still greater lines of character, and who, with all his ferocity in war, had, with a cultivating hand, preserved his country the wealth which it derived from benignant skies and a prolific soil—if, observing the wide and general devastation of fields unclothed and brown; of vegetation burned up and extinguished; of villages depopulated and in ruin; of temples unroofed and perishing; of reservoirs broken down and dry, this stranger should ask “What has thus laid waste this beautiful and opulent land; what monstrous madness has ravage

with widespread war; what desolating foreign foe, what civil discords; what disputed succession; what religious zeal; what fabled monster has stalked abroad, and, with malice and mortal enmity to man, withered by the grasp of death every growth of nature and humanity, all means of delight, and each original, simple principle of bare existence?" the answer would have been, "Not one of those causes! No wars have ravaged these lands and depopulated these villages! No desolating foreign foe! No domestic broils! No disputed succession! No religious, superserviceable zeal! No poisonous monster! No affliction of Providence, which, while it scourged us, cut off the sources of resuscitation! No! This damp of death is the mere effusion of British amity! We sink under the pressure of their support! We writhe under their perfidious grip! They have embraced us with their protecting arms, and lo! these are the fruits of their alliance?"

AFTER A CENTURY AND HALF

Today, after a century and a half of British rule, we are poor, underfed, illiterate, backward in all respects where Government help was necessary, thwarted in all matters where no such help was needed. This is neither mere logic, nor rhetoric; it is the testimony of facts mostly found by Britishers.

All this deterioration, all the humiliation and wretchedness through which we have been dragged, has been the result of British trusteeship. I write in no spirit of bitterness. I believe in Indo-British friendship as partners. I have never been happy when an opportunity of cementing such a friendship has been

missed. I am putting forward these facts at this moment to say how genuine is our hunger for Swaraj. No British bureaucrat who had the destiny of this country in his hands and betrayed it need bewail like the Governor-designate of Madras that his services—or misservices—have not evoked gratitude.

The universal desire which has taken possession of the Indian mind to get rid of British Rule in India is neither a sentimental urge nor a mere political ambition; even if it were such, it would not be wrong. Indians are convinced that British Rule has been anything but pleasant. It would not be out of place to recapitulate the factual basis of this ardent desire this hunger for Independence. These facts though marshalled against British rule are of immense value to any National Government to find what progress has to be achieved in order to make good the all round deficit which we are facing today as compared to other advanced nations of the world.

INDUSTRIES DESTROYED

Industrially, India, as a land of cottage-industries, was highly advanced in the pre-British period. Delhi produced cotton cloth. Lahore produced fine white cloth, coloured silk, embroidery, carpets, woollen goods, tents, saddles, swords, boots; Agra, cotton and silk fabrics, lace gold and silver embroideries; Patna, silk and cotton goods, shields, swords, artistic pottery, salt petre; Benares, muslins, silk stuffs, embroideries, belts, turbans; Srinagar, shawls, carpets, beds, trays, boxes and woodenware; Dacca, finest and richest muslins and silks; Ahmedabad produced gold and silver cloth, silks, gold and silver work and jewellery; according to De Lacet it was 'almost as large as London.'

Many other cities like Samana, Khairabad, Burhanpur, Rajmahal, Multan, Masulipatam, were noted for their handicrafts.

"The fact is there is probably no great people in the entire world among whom the practical things of life, that is, the practical activities, occupations and industries which accompany civilisation, have been more fully developed than among the people of India for two or three hundred years, upto the time of the coming of the British....This is shown by the fact that their wealth was so great. It was their wealth that attracted the British. This wealth was created by their best and varied industries."

SPOILS OF THE PLUNDER

The epoch between 1600 and 1800, according to Radha Kamal Mukerjee, represented at once the golden age of Indian trade and industry and the beginning of her economic downfall that was as sudden as it was complete and unprecedented. No wonder between the battle of Plassey in 1757 and the Battle of Waterloo in 1815 about 1000 million pounds were transferred from Indian hoards to English banks. "Possibly since the world began no investment has ever yielded the profit of the spoils of Indian plunder, because for nearly fifty years Great Britain stood without a competitor." The historian H. H. Wilson in 1813 observed to the same effect. "British goods were forced upon her (India) without paying any duty and the manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have competed on equal terms."

After the Battle of Plassey "the shower of wealth fell copiously on the company and its servants. A sum

of 800 thousand pounds sterling, in coined silver, was sent down to Fort William. Trade revival and the signs of affluence appeared in every English house." Capital accumulation and Industrial Revolution in England followed capital depletion and industrial devolution in India. As Brook Adams rightly remarks "In themselves inventions are passive, many of the most important having lain dormant for centuries waiting for a sufficient store of force to have accumulated to set them working....Before the influx of the Indian treasure and the expansion of credit which followed, no force sufficient for this existed and had Watt lived fifty years earlier, he and his invention must have perished together." In 1841 Labouchere, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, stated "The British have utterly destroyed the manufactures of India by their manufactures. The district of Dacca, the Manchester of India, has dwindled into insignificance."

And with the aid of this loot, Britain vanquished Napoleon and built her political supremacy in the world.

ROBBED OF COMMERCE, TRADE AND SHIPPING

It would not be an exaggeration to say that Britain has robbed us of our commerce.

In pre-British times, on Travernier's testimony, India's exports fell into five categories, silks, cloth, cottons, spices, drugs. Manufactures formed a large proportion of exports. Under British rule, no doubt the volume of trade has increased considerably, mainly cause of the development of world trade in general. But the character of Indian export and import trade is fundamentally altered. 77 per cent of the imports 1909-14 were manufactured articles; it was over 68 per cent in the quinquennium preceding the present war.

Many contemporary authorities testify to Indian industrial and commercial products of the 17th and 18th centuries. Some two hundred distinct items of both goods are mentioned as export specialities. Even about 1750, the East India Co., engaged the work of over 40,000 looms (about 50,000 weavers) in the South. The total number of weavers in South India was over half a million and in Bengal, a million. Philip Anderson said "The manufactures of England could not compete with those of India."

BUILDING BRITAIN ON INDIA'S GRAVE

Britain unable to compete envied our manufactures. Milburn thus accounts for the English Prohibition and Sumptuary Laws of 1700-1730: "The use of printed Indian cloth and calicoes both in apparel and household furniture was at this time so universal as to be a great detriment and obstruction to the woollen and silk manufactures of the kingdom. This had occasioned several riots and tumults of the weavers in London. It was therefore found necessary to redress the grievance wherein so many were interested. An Act of Parliament was in consequence passed to preserve and encourage the woollen and silk manufactures. It absolutely prohibited the wear of Indian cloth under the penalty of £5 for each offence on the wearer and £20 on the seller." Britain now need not get shocked if India, denied of Government help, imposes a voluntary boycott to save her own trade.

The total annual export of Indian handloom products from Bengal alone was heavy. Holland took 6,000 to 7,000 bales of silk annually; the merchants of Tartary took another 7,000 bales (each bale of 1,400 sq. yards). This was what Travernier estimated. Moreland estimated the total yearly exports of Indian handloom products by sea in the 17th century at about 60 million sq. yards, of which 32 million sq. yards went to Europe.

In 1779 the import duties were raised in England to £67-10-0 per cent on plain white calicoes. Prof. H. H. Wilson writes: "It was stated in evidence in 1813 that the cotton and silk goods of India upto this period could be sold in the British market at a price from 50 to 60 per cent lower than those fabricated in Eng-

land." Then Manchester came to be built on the grave of India's commerce. The author adds: "Had this not been the case, had not such prohibitory duties and decrees existed, the mills of Paesley and Manchester would have stopped in their outset and could hardly have been again set in motion, even by the power of steam. They were created by the sacrifice of Indian manufactures.

TRADE FLOW REVERSED

But Britain became the master of India and soon destroyed her export trade. The Select Committee of the House of Lords stated in 1831: "The chief manufactures of India having been supplanted to a great extent by the manufactures of England, not only the market of this country but in that of India itself, it has become an object of the deepest concern to improve the production of the soil."

By 1846 the tables were completely turned. India did not export any cotton goods at all, but had to import from England 214 million yards of cloth as compared with 5 million in 1835 and 8 lakhs yards in 1814.

In 1938-39 our export trade was 45 per cent raw materials; 23 per cent foodstuffs, and 30 per cent semi-manufactured and manufactured articles. Import trade in the same year had grown to about 70 per cent manufactures, mostly finished consumption goods.

India has had to maintain a continual favourable balance of trade by exporting raw materials to meet the invisible items of imports, home charges, debt, services, and payments, etc. Our exports being mostly raw materials and other primary products, balances of trade have been invariably against us.

Foreign Trade of India—Value in lakhs of Rupees
(Quinquennial averages)

Period.		Imports.	Exports.	Balance.
1864-65 to 68-69	..	3170	5586	2416
1869-70 to 73-74	..	3304	5625	2321
1874-75 to 78-79	..	3836	6032	2196
1879-80 to 83-84	..	5016	7908	2892
1884-85 to 88-89	..	6151	8864	2713
1889-90 to 93-94	..	7078	10453	3386
1899-1900 to 1903-04	..	8468	12492	4024
1904-05 to 1908-09	..	11985	16544	4559
1909-10 to 1913-14	..	15125	22583	6658
1919-20 to 1923-24	..	26705	30638	3933
1924-25 to 28-29	..	25102	35351	10249
1929-30 to 1933-34	..	16114	19860	3746
1934-35 to 1938-39	..	14636	17645	3009
1939-40	..	16895	21308	4413
1940-41	..	15700	19900	4200
1941-42	..	17300	25300	8000
1942-43	..	11000	19400	8400

These balances are not real, but fictitious. They do not show the real gain to India. This apparent gain is set off against the home charges, or, in ordinary language, forced tribute paid by slave India to her political master, Britain. The exports are not voluntary, or arising out of real surplus, but an exaction which has to be paid even by denying to ourselves the necessities of life.

These figures representing balance of trade only represent the export and import of commodities as found in the records of the customs department. To strike a real balance, invisible exports and imports must also be taken into account. Pre-war Britain would appear to be the poorest country in the world because its custom house figures invariably indicated an unfavourable balance. She was rich because of her invisible income arising out of banking, shipping,

insurance and dividends earned on investments abroad as also the savings of Britishers serving abroad.

In the pre-British period, India derived income from all these invisible sources. Britain has seen to it that all these sources are eliminated for all practical purposes.

INDIA'S SHIPPING ELIMINATED

Indian shipping was a great factor in the world till the British came and destroyed it.

In 1420, Nicole Conti described with admiration the Indian skill in ship-building. "The natives of India build some ships larger than ours, capable of containing 2000 butts. Some ships are so built in compartments that should one part be shattered, the other portion remaining, the same may accomplish the voyage."

A letter dated 16th December, 1670 from the factory at Balsore to the Court of Directors in London runs: "Many English merchants and others have their ships and vessels yearly built....Very expert master-builders there are several here. They build very well and launch with as much discretion as I have seen in any part of the world." Their skill was an example for others to emulate. Even as late as in 1802, ships and warships were built for England in India. England borrowed plans and designs from Indian builders.

The vessel from Gogha, the *Reheni*, captured by the Portuguese had a tonnage of 1,500 tons. In 1612, Sir H. Middleton saw at Surat a ship that was 153 ft. long, 42 feet broad, 31 feet deep and carried a burden of 1,500 tons. And even so late as the beginning of 19th century 300-400 tons was considered the standard for a fair-sized sea-going ship in England.

In the size of ships and in number also we excelled.

Lord Wellesley wrote: "The port of Calcutta contains about 10,000 tons of shipping built in India. From the quantity of tonnage now at command, from the state of perfection which the art of ship-building has already attained in Bengal (promising a still more rapid progress) it is certain that this port will always be able to furnish the tonnage to whatever extent may be required for conveying to the Port of London the trade of the Private British merchants of Bengal."

"Ships built at Bombay were executed one-fourth cheaper than in the docks of England." From a "Register of ships built on the Hugli from 1781-1839" it appears that the total number of ships built was 376. The best building years during the period were 1801, 1813, 1876, when 10,079, 10,376 and 8,198 tons respectively were launched.

The British borrowed Indian models. In 1811, a Frenchman, F. Baltazar Salvyus, in his *Les Hindous*, testified, "In ancient times the Indians excelled in the art of constructing vessels. . . . (They) can still offer models to Europe so much so that the English, attentive to everything which relates to naval architecture have borrowed many improvements from them which they have adopted with success to their own shipping.

The Indian vessels unite elegance and utility and are models of patience and fine workmanship."

During the 18th century, India built up and maintained considerable trade with the Near East, Persian Gulf Region, Java, Sumatra, West and East Africa, etc.

Dr. Taylor says: "The arrival in the port of London of Indian produce in Indian built ships created a sensation among the monopolists which could not be exceeded if a hostile fleet had appeared in the

Thames. Ship-builders in the Port of London took the lead in raising the cry of alarm. They declared that their business was in danger and that the families of all the shipwrights in England were certain to be reduced to starvation."

As a result, the British Parliament started a war on Indian shipping and enacted in 1814 that no ship, even British, could enter London which had not aboard, three-fourths of its crew of British mariners.

"Thus," says Radha Kamal Mukerjee, "has passed out one of the great national industries of India after a long and brilliant history, covering a period of more than twenty centuries. It was undoubtedly one of the triumphs of Indian civilisation, the chief means by which that civilisation asserted itself and influenced other alien civilisations. There can hardly be conceived a more serious obstacle in the path of her industrial development than this almost complete extinction of her shipping and ship-building."

THE "DIVINE" DISPENSATION

And now I may turn to the period, to use the words of our leaders of the last century, of the Divine dispensation which sent Britain to India. Sir Herbert Fitzherbert, Flag Officer, the Indian Navy, said in 1940: "At the present moment no ship building industry exists although, as everyone knows, in the past India's ship-building industry was world-famous. Such an industry to be successful needs courage, enterprise, forethought. That all these are present in India is a fact that cannot be denied."

India has now the smallest mercantile marine. While Britain's foreign trade is about 5 times that of India, Britain's tonnage is 140 times as large. As the

Commerce Member of the Government of India put it, India possesses "a distressingly small number of deep sea ships."!

Who is responsible for this grievous downfall?

All recent efforts to revive the industry have been frustrated by Britain. 106 Indian Shipping Companies with a nominal capital of 150 million pounds came into existence in the last half a century. Less than 10 have survived. The total tonnage of all these in 1938-39 was a meagre $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of tons. Today there is no place worth the name in the overseas trade for Indian shipping and we have less than 25 per cent share even in our own coastal traffic. Sir Alfred Watson says: "Indian Company after Indian company endeavoured to develop a coastal service has been financially shattered by the heavy combination of British interests."

How the Scinda Steam Navigation Company survived the competition of British companies is a matter of recent history.

Our overseas and coastal trade is very large. India's coastline is over 4,000 miles. Our yearly coastal trade is 7 million tons of coal, rice, oils, timber etc. and 2 million passengers. Our overseas trade consists of 25 million tons valued at Rs. 3,200 million a year and a lakh of passengers every year between India and foreign countries.

Assuming that India had 50 per cent share (overall) in these trades the annual loss in freight alone today is over Rs. 150,000,000,

Practically our whole sea-going traffic has passed into British hands.

World's Merchant Marine in 1939 in Millions of Tons.

U.K.	U.S.A.	Germany	Japan	India.
18	13	4.5	5.6	0.13

And what is our share in our country's sea-borne trade and coastal traffic?

Sea-borne trade.	Coastal trade.
British vessels 66.6%	British Cos. 80%
Foreign vessels 30.0%	Indian Cos. 20%
British Indian 3.4%	

Indian shipping was deliberately destroyed and its growth in recent times stunted only in the interests of Britain.

III

FROM PLENTY TO POVERTY UNPARALLELED

Dr. Josiah Oldfield who visited India in a letter to the "Daily News" bitterly commented upon the poverty of India:

"I have", he said, "just returned from a study of the Indian problems on the spot and cannot urge too earnestly before your readers the intense pathos of seeing village after village with all the men, still more the women and the children, showing those pitiful signs of a daily struggle to live, with only half enough to live upon.... I have seen the poverty of the English villages and the desolation of the London slums, but I have seen nothing that haunts me more than the spectacle of those brave, honest, hardworking economical people toiling on, week after week with only a piece of coarse *bajri* or *jowar* bread."

Several impartial foreign observers have pointed out the increasing poverty of India under British Rule. Hyndman, the Economist, stated years ago:

"Even as we look on, India is becoming feebler and feebler. The very life blood of the great multitude, under our rule, is slowly, yet ever faster, ebbing away."

Ramsay MacDonald, the late Prime Minister of Britain, gave his impression of Indian poverty in these words:

"The poverty of India is not an opinion; it is a fact. For days and days one goes through the land and sees nothing but thin bodies toiling, toiling, trudging, trudging. India is the home of the poverty-stricken."

According to him "the people are the most industrious in the world; much of their land is fertile and yields rich crops." But, he says, "We spend far too much of the income of India on imperial purposes and far too little on Indian development."

Rushbrook Williams in 1923-24 charged Britain with gross neglect of India's resources. He says: "the real truth is that the undeniable poverty of India arises principally from the fact that the country is not organised for the production of wealth."

CONTRASTS IN INCOMES

This is not merely opinion evidence. It is based on facts. Prof. K. T. Shah on an estimate made in 1921 said: "Two-thirds of the community get per head half the average income while one per cent enjoy more than one-third of the national wealth." To give the exact percentage "62.4 per cent of the people of India earned 37.5 per cent of the national income; 32.9 per cent of them drew 31.8 per cent; while the remaining 4.7 per cent enjoyed 30.7 per cent of the total."

When the world has grown richer, we have been forced into increasing poverty. Lord Stamp prepared a comparative estimate of national incomes in international units. He defined an I.U. as "amount of goods and services which one dollar would purchase in the U.S.A. over the average of the period 1925-34." Taking

this as a unit he calculated the national income as follows:

U.S.A.	..	1381	I. U's
Great Britain	..	1069	I. U's
Japan	..	353	I. U's
U.S.S.R.	..	320	I. U's.
British India	..	200	I. U's.

Since these calculations were made by Lord Stamp U.S.S.R. has registered a phenomenal progress and has caught up with the U.K. and U.S.A. while India remains no better than she was.

The total wealth produced in British India in 1931-32 is estimated to be Rs. 1,690 crores with primary production contributing a little over 52 per cent. Famines have been more frequent and more intensive than before. "India's famines have been severer, and more frequent, its agricultural poverty has deepened, its rural population has become more hopelessly in debt; their despair more desperate."

MANIPULATION OF EXCHANGE

During World War I (1914-1918) India supplied goods and services to Britain and acquired a large balance of trade of about 400 crores. After the war ended, British Government manipulated the currency and exchange through the sales of Indian sterling balances. The rupee rose to 35d. Within a short time our well-earned balance of trade was wiped out. Sterling assets were frittered away, the Britishers making money at India's cost. The Rupee slumped from 19d. to 18d. The 400 crores which we had earned in four years were lost in one.

Despite a countrywide protest the ratio was fixed at 18d. The result was that India made a loss of 12½ per cent on exports. Britain gained an advantage of

12½ per cent on our imports. This process is continuing for the last two decades.

Then India was caught in the world-wide economic depression, and being an agricultural country suffered the most. In spite of the country's demand to delink the Rupee from Sterling and expand the currency in circulation, the demand was ignored. In order to live India had to sell gold which was her traditional insurance reserve built up for centuries. Between 1931 and 1940 India's nett export of distress gold was about 11,65,69,144 tolas of gold valued at Rs. 3,82,52,38,069. The average price at which Indian gold was sold was thus Rs. 32-12-0 per tola.

During the last three years India bought about 2 crores tolas of gold, about 1/5th of what we had sold. But we were made to pay about Rs. 75/- per tola when the official rate maintained was Rs. 42/- to Rs. 43/- per tola. Thus we lost both ways.

IV

IMPERIALIST WARS—AT INDIA'S EXPENSE

We shed our blood and paid for our own enslavement. Since then we have been fighting Britain's wars in order that she may be powerful enough to keep us in slavery. It is evidently the most immoral aspect of all imperialisms.

The Committee appointed by the Indian National Congress in 1931 to scrutinise the financial transactions of the East India Company and the British Government in India and the so-called public debt of India came to the conclusion that enormous war charges have been unjustifiably debited to India.

Year.	Subject of claim	Amount (in Crores of Rs.)
Prior to 1857	External wars of the E. I. Cos. Interest on Co's capital	35 15.12 } 50.12
1857	Cost of Mutiny	40.0
1874	Interest on E. I. Coy's. capital Redemption of the Capital stock of the E. I. Coy.	10.08 } 12.00 } 22.08
1857-1900	Cost of External wars.	37.5
1914-1920	European War gift Cost.	189 } 170 } 359.0
1857-1931	Miscellaneous charges	20 }
	In respect of Burma	82 }
1916-1921	Reverse Council losses	102.0
	Premium paid to Rly Cos. on acquisition by the State	35.0 }
1916-21	Cost of Strategic Railways.	50.0 33.0
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	Total Rs.	728.7

In addition to this, India has borne a share of the normal military expenditure, which would properly be debitible to the British Exchequer, Mr. Kumarappa, a member of the Committee, computed this share at about Rs. 540.13 crores upto 1913. This is about one-fourth of the normal military expenditure. Ramsay MacDonald himself suggested that half of this expenditure should devolve on the British treasury.

By 1931 a sum of Rs. 1,050 crores was paid out as interest to U.K. and a refund of Rs. 536.02 crores was claimed back by the Congress.

Total as per above statement	Rs. 729. crores
Share of annual military expenditure	,, 540.13 ,,
Interest wrongly paid out	,, 536.02 ,,
	<hr/>
	Rs 1805.15 crores

ARMED FORCES FOR BRITAIN'S BENEFIT

The army expenditure in India is mainly intended to help Britain to retain her empire. Ramsay MacDonald said: "A large part of the army in India—certainly one-half—is an imperial army which we require for other than purely Indian purposes and its costs, therefore, should be met from Imperial and not Indian funds."

Mr. Buchanan, a member of the Welby Commission, said: "In so far as the military defence of India is concerned, India pays everything and the U.K. nothing in discharging these imperial duties. India has a fair claim that part of the burden should be borne by the Imperial Exchequer. As to the equity of the claim on the part of India, there can be no doubt."

The Indian Army is in fact a predominantly British Army. Just prior to World War II the sanctioned

strength of the army was 144,000 Indian and 52,000 British soldiers. But of the 7,200 officers, as many as 6,900 were British. This was because of a set policy. A Royal Commission after the Great Revolt of 1857 recommended that an irresistible force of British troops should be retained in India while a later Commission proposed that artillery should be mainly a European force.

Officers are mostly British. In spite of war developments, the proportion of Indian to British officers is still 1:4. The Indian Navy was established in 1934, and a part of the burden, so far borne by the British Naval budget, was transferred to Indian shoulders. By 1941 the R.I.N. had grown six times, but there was not even a single cruiser in the Navy. The first R.I.A.F. squadron was formed in 1933 but was completed in 1939, after six years.

The Indian land army, actually the Indian part of it, is antiquated, lacking most of the latest weapons and is officered mostly by the British. Our R.I.N. and R.I.A.F. are a mockery even in 1946.

IN THE NAME OF DEFENCE

Expenditure of imperial expeditions has always been borne by India. Between 1838 and 1920 the Indian army was engaged outside India for Imperial purposes on nineteen occasions. A large part of the expenditure incurred by these expeditions was borne by the Indian taxpayer.

In 1904 Sir E. Ellis stated frankly: "I think it is undoubted that the Indian army in future must be a main factor in the maintenance of balance of power in Asia."

Egypt Expedition (1882), Frontier Wars (1882-92), Burma War (1886), and Bhutan War (1863) added to the Indian public debt a burden of about Rs. 100 crores. In the time of Lord Wellesley we bore the expenditure of expeditions to Ceylon, Moluccus, Singapore, Isle of France, Cape Colony and Egypt; and to Java in Lord Minto's time. We also bore the cost of the wars with Nepal; of Burmese wars (1824-26 and 1852-53); of Afghan wars; of wars with Persia and China (upto 1858). At our cost and with the blood of Indian soldiers Britain consolidated her imperial position in Asia. We continued to be slaves in peace and cannon fodder in war. We have lived only so that Britain's power may flourish. And the tragedy of it, the help we gave to Britain was itself the instrument of our subjection.

A comparative statement of proportion of the expenditure on defence to the total public expenditure (1927-28) is an illuminating commentary on British trusteeship of India.

Japan	26.6
Italy	23.5
France	19.8
U.S.A.	16.1
U.S.S.R.	16.0
U. K.	14.7
Germany	7.2
Australia	6.5
India	45.3

OPPRESSIVE TAXATION

In India, for most people, there is little margin over subsistence. Taxation has, therefore, to be judged not from absolute tax figures. What has to be considered is the proportion which is appropriated by the public authorities from the net national income and the incidence of this tax burden on individuals in dif-

ferent income groups. Taxation must be examined in the context of the margin that is left over the basic minimum national dividend required for the necessities and reasonable comforts of life. If in that context it is oppressive, it retards the growth of the country.

In free countries, a tax, as it is said, like the sun absorbs moisture from one spot and gives it to another, public expenditure benefits the taxpayers themselves. But in India most of the taxation is only intended to keep India safe for Britain, fight Britain's wars, and exact tribute. Indian public expenditure on creative social services is very little, while most of the tax collections are expended on defence and other security and administrative services.

THE MILITARY, WHITE ELEPHANT

		1891-95	1911-15	1921-25	1936-37
Debt Charges	4.4	2.3	19.3	16.3
Law & Justice	3.9	6.1	7.9	7.1
Policet	3.9	7.4	12.3	11.2
Education	1.5	4.3	9.9	11.9
Agriculture	0.8	2.0	2.0
Public	1.9	3.5	5.9	5.6
Defence	25.1	30.5	60.6	47.4

In 1938-39, that is the last pre-war year, total Central and Provincial expenditure on revenue account was Rs. 208 crores. Of this expenditure, Defence services claimed Rs. 52 crores, while total expenditure on security functions was 86 crores of rupees, i.e., 41 per cent. Expenditure on social services was Rs. 34 crores or 16 per cent. Out of this Rs. 12.5 crores were spent on education; Rs. 4 crores on medicine; Rs. 2 crores on public health; Rs. 2 crores on agriculture and a crore only on industrial development.

The proportion of development expenditure is extremely low.

	% of total expenditure	per head.
		Rs.
U. K.	27	77
U. S. A. 1931-32 (Federal)	24	24
India 1938-39	16	1

Local bodies, in addition, spent in U.K. (1936-37) Rs. 135 crores on education and in U.S.A. Rs. 368 crores. In India the sum so spent was Rs. 4 crores, in 1938-39.

If the Central and Provincial expenditure is taken together the *per capita* expenditure on the head is insignificant.

	Education	Medical	Public Health
	(in lakhs of Rupees)		
1937-38	1192.7	375.1	189.1
1939-40	1303.8	401.7	186.5
Per capita (1939-40)	0 7 0	0 2 0	0 1 0

But when we look to Defence Expenditure we see how the burden on India is heavy.

	% of Total Tax Revenue to total Exp. on defence.	% of Direct Tax Revenue to total tax revenue	
		Pre-war	1942-43.
U.K.	50	56	64
U.S.A.	26	50	73
Canada	50	37	64
India	55	24	61

By 1931, therefore, Britain, had taken advantage of her position as the imperial slave owner of India and under this head alone wrongfully appropriated to herself Rs. 1800.55 crores for becoming a world power.

These wars were all fought by Britain without India's consent, and all were imperialist wars from beginning to end. Incidentally, they served to keep India in subjection.

The following figures show how the defence expenditure has piled up from 1938-39.

Defence Expenditure
(Revenue Account)

Year.	Crores of Rs.	Year	Crores of Rs.
1938-39	46.18	1941-42	103.93
1939-40	49.54	1944-45	397.23 (Revised Estimate)
1940-41	73.61	1945-46	394.23 (Revised Estimate)
Capital portion 1944-45		59.4 crores.	

Total defence expenditure including capital expenditure was Rs. 1610 crores, Defence expenditure per day (1944-45) was 109.5 lakhs (Revenue account).

THE STERLING BALANCES

The non-budgeted war burden is still greater.

The sterling balances and the prevailing inflation in India are the result of the British policy of fighting her wars at India's cost. During the last six years from 1939 to 1945 the British Government in India acquired for World War II the fruits of the labour of 400 million people, toiling all day and half the night. In addition, millions of Indians supplied services to Britain.

In fact, a large portion of the sterling balances today represent goods acquired at controlled rates in order to meet the emergency of World War II. These goods were acquired by Britain at a price much below the parity price of the said goods in Britain. Control of prices was introduced in India. Was it for India's good? Certainly not. So Britain for its war and allied purposes acquired goods from us at artificially controlled low prices and considerable part of them were sold through the quasi-officially conducted U.K.C.C. at very high prices, depriving India of the benefit, and enriching Britain to that extent. On the other hand

for our day to day needs we had to pay higher price for the same goods in the black market. Thus Britain for her war acquired Indian goods at an artificial low price since 1943; we had to pay an artificially higher price in order to subsist during a war not exactly our own.

For all these materials and services supplied by India what has Britain given in exchange? Britain has transferred to Indian ownership about £360 million capital invested by Britain before the war. In addition to this amount the Reserve Bank of India has received a credit of 1300 million paper sterlings. The sterlings are in ordinary language I.O.U. promissory notes passed by a bankrupt Britain to a starving creditor India.

India was dragged into the war without her consent. She was made to part with men and materials under compulsion. At the same time she was forced to accept I.O.U.s of Britain because debtor Britain is the political master of India.

THE DEATH GRIP OF INFLATION

From 1942 Britain took goods and services against her I.O.U.s and gave us cartloads of currency notes. This sent up prices sky-high and produced a false sense of wealth. The inflation spiral which has been at work can be shown at a glance by the following table:

Period	Notes in circulation	Sterling securities.	Rupee securities.	prices are taken at 100 Calcutta index of whole sale prices.	If July 1924	If Aug. 1939
				Economic Adviser's Index.		
(In Crores of rupees)						
1939-40	..	208.9	78.3	37.4	115	126*
1940-41		241.6	130.0	48.6	119	115
1941-42		308.5	165.5	75.6	144	137
1944 Dec.		560.6	388.3	126.1	238	185
1945 Apr.		677.6	501.5	127.7	272 (March)	214
1-2-1946	1181.5	11.35		57.8		
				(1943)	307	
				(1945)		
				Jan.)	299	

Balance held abroad Rs. 547.3 crores.

The real volume of notes in circulation is not 1181.5 but about 250 crores more representing one rupee notes and coins issued on the liability of the Government of India. The total of currency in circulation, therefore, is roughly 1,450 crores.

* (Last 7 months of 1939-40.)

During the decade starting from 1930 the deflationary movements had created indebtedness in the country on account of ruinous low prices of farm products. The irony of it was that the producer had nothing to maintain his staying power. Whatever he had, he gave away in heavy interest charges, in land revenue and in meeting indirect taxation all of which were based on high price-levels of farm products. Britain took full advantage of this situation.

After World War II began, circumstances became favourable for the Indian farmer. Then he was denied the compensation.

The way in which this indebtedness has been increased is, to say the least, economically unjustifiable and morally scandalous. Britain wanted to foist her sterling I.O.U.s on India. There were enough Indian princes, zamindars, bankers, capitalists and industrialists who live on British support who could have been forced to take up sterling loans. But Britain took advantage of an innocent provision of the Reserve Bank of India Act by issuing paper currency against sterling securities. The British Government used this legal device to such an extent that the sterling securities against currency aggregated to Rs. 1135 crores. Cost of living went up; people were starved. This is the Government that now wants to mobilise moral indignation of the uninformed against the middle and upper classes in India who happened to hold high denomination notes.

When and how will this debt be paid?

'At the time of the Round Table Conference India was indebted to Britain, Britain was the creditor. And as a creditor, it demanded manifold commercial safeguards against India. Now that Britain is indebted to

India, there is no suggestion of any safeguard in the interest of India against Britain. On the contrary there is the talk of scaling down Britain's indebtedness.

If might is right, this is right. If justice and fairplay between nations has any meaning these proposals are a cruel mockery.

It is an iniquitous proposal to scale down Britain's sterling indebtedness to India. The iniquity is an unjustified use of political domination. Britain the debtor, so far as India is concerned has valuable assets in this country as well as abroad. She still holds in India substantial rupee assets in the form of properties, equities and securities. Why should not these be utilised first to pay Britain's debt? The debtor, the average Briton, is 33 times richer than the creditor, the average Indian. Why should a rich debtor refuse to pay a poor creditor—a creditor whom the debtor has impoverished and whom an accident has placed in an advantageous position?

British Government has been the parent of this gross inflation. This inflation, as I have pointed out, has been the result of unscrupulous use of an obviously innocent provision of the Reserve Bank of India Act. And although the War is now over, this provision is being exploited as an instrument for further inflation. Who produces cart-loads of currency even now? Why was this potent seed of uncontrollable inflation sown in this country?

In September 1939 the currency notes circulating in India were Rs. 182,13,17,000. In the beginning of January 1946 the total of the currency notes in circulation had risen to Rs. 1,218,34,58,000. This is an increase of about 600 per cent.

The increase in this currency circulation is achieved by lodging sterling securities and issuing rupee notes. On the 2nd of September, 1939, the sterling securities were worth Rs. 59,50,11,000. In the beginning of this year they stood at Rs. 1,120,32,89,000.

Inflation, therefore, is purposely introduced in this country to lend money to Britain against the growing pile of her I.O.U.s. There is any amount of talk about scaling down a substantial portion of this debt but not a finger is raised against this compulsion, to use the words of the recent manifesto of Indian economists, 'on a poor famine-stricken country by lending through currency inflation large sums to a country which is among the richest in the world.'

One would have naturally expected that the first and foremost elementary anti-inflationary measure would be to stop issuing rupee notes against I.O.U.s. of Britain at a time when the debtor wants to scale down his indebtedness by virtue of being in military occupation of this country. But the Government of India cannot do anything so obvious. The public would very much like to know what the Indian Directors of the Reserve Bank have to say about what the manifesto describes as "unjustifiable negligence of India's legitimate interests."

INCREASING INDEBTEDNESS

The debt position of India is also a cruel commentary on the way in which Britain has administered India's finances. In 1858 the public debt of India was £112 millions. By March 1937 it had risen to Rs. 1,208 crores. About 30 per cent of this debt was held outside India. Out of a total of Rs. 1199.7 crores, 483.1 crores were held in England, 485.87 in India. In addi-

tion there was an unfunded debt of 219.9 crores and a deposit of Rs. 20.82 crores. Thus the total held in India was Rs. 706.6 crores.

In 1941-42 the total public debt was Rs. 1,209 crores, of which 210.7 was external and 998.5 was Indian. In the budget estimate of 1945-46 the total interest bearing obligation is Rs. 2,206 crores against 1,848 crores in 1944-45. Of this debt Rs. 1,010 crores, are covered by interest yielding assets. Cash and securities represent Rs. 547 crores. There is a further non-covered debt of Rs. 650 crores as against a pre-war figure of Rs. 200 crores.

SOARING PRICES

The index numbers at the same time prove the steep rise in wholesale prices. These prices have been 'stabilised' at about 245. If the base year ended August 1938-39 is taken at 100, the general rate of wholesale price in October 1944 was 243.4; in October 1945, 244.1; and in January 1945, 250.3.

The industrial and raw materials index shows a similar rise.

September 1945	238.1
December 1945	251.0
19th Jan. 1946	263.6

The food index shows a similar tendency. If the index for the week ended 26th of August 1939 is equal to 100, the rise has been more than double:

September 1945	238.2
December 1945	238.8

The annual average for 1945 is 235.6 while the index for the week ended 2nd February, 1946, indicate 240.4.

Inflation in the hands of a National Government has many advantages; but as operated by Britain it has harmed the man with the fixed income and not benefited 85 per cent of the population which depends upon agriculture.

BLACK MARKETS

The indices, however, are misleading. They are calculated on the basis of official prices which are not real. They do not take into account the black markets which have come into existence as a result of shortage of supply and inefficient administration. Most of the commodities, as we all know to our cost, are only to be had at black market prices. The price levels, therefore, are very much higher than what indices indicate.

Britain has in this way walked into an impossible position. Dr. Kumarappa, the well-known economist, has described the Reserve Bank of India as "the imperial pawn shop." I do not like to use such a harsh comparison. But what has the Reserve Bank done? The Government of India have lent to Britain sterlings by currency manipulation, Rs. 1,700 crores at a nominal interest of less than 1 per cent. These 1,700 crores are made up of 1,135 crores sterling securities in Issue Department and 542 crores held as balances abroad.

What does the Government of India do? It borrows money from the public in India at 3 per cent. What would be the state of an ordinary person if he borrowed at 3 per cent and lent at less than 1 per cent? It is bad bargain, bad business. It is an immoral deal. It is scarcely surprising that the people have no confidence in the loans issued by Govern-

ment. The "Commerce" of the 26th January, 1946 has the following statement:—

"That a very substantial portion of the 2½ per cent. 1960 loan must have been taken by the Reserve Bank of India is now clear from an increase of no less than Rs. 8.05 crores in the Bank's own investment portfolio, as disclosed by its statement for the week ended 18th January, 1946. The poor response from the public is also reflected in the rise of over Rs. 10 crores in notes in circulation in the week in which the list for the new loan opened. It is needless to add that, had the public responded to the new loan in large amounts, the expansion in notes in circulation would not have been so heavy."

CURRENCY JUGGLERY

Britain, through its agent, the Government of India, has caused inflation in this country by the misuse of the power to issue rupee currency against sterling security given to the Reserve Bank of India. The black marketeer is supplied with tons of paper money. He is no doubt an anti-social criminal, but what about the Government which lavishly provided the means wherewith to carry on his nefarious trade?

The position has become wellnigh impossible.

First, Britain will not pay the large sterling debt;

Secondly, if it does not pay, it would lead to extreme bitterness between Britain and India.

Thirdly, if in exchange for these sterling debt, Britain dumps unwanted and uneconomic manufactured goods, India's industrial development would be thwarted for a century.

Fourthly, if the sterling debt is scaled down without setting off the 600 crores of Britain's rupee assets in this country it will be a piece of robbery which will never be forgiven by India.

Fifthly, if inflation is sought to be controlled by devices like the Demonetisation Ordinance whatever credit the Government possesses will disappear; wage-earners who have been thinking in terms of inflated money will become disgruntled; a social and economic crisis will follow. These results of currency jugglery are moving like a Greek tragedy to a pre-ordained catastrophe.

Out of the morass into which the financial jugglery of Britain has landed India there is no escape for Britain except to give India the bargaining power by giving it a National Government. A National Government alone can take a bold step, regulate the repayment of the sterling debt, and impose upon the people willing sacrifices in order to restore the credit of the Government. The drastic measures which this step involves cannot possibly be carried out by a distrusted foreign government.

THE POVERTY WHICH BRITAIN WROUGHT

In spite of a few spectacular fortunes in the hands of a very small number of industrialists, British Rule has definitely brought growing poverty to India. Incontrovertible figures establish the fact.

The present agricultural wages in Northern India is worth only about one-half of the quantity of food-grains available to the agricultural worker or day-labourer on the prevailing scale of wages in Akbar's time. Both Pelsaert and De Laet mention that during the Mogul times the lower classes were consuming butter every day with *khichri*. Terry specifically mentions "the great store of salt, abundance of sugar growing in India." Sugar, sold at 2d. per lb. (about 5 pies), entered more commonly as an item of household consumption of the poorer classes than in modern India. Blochmann observes that under the Moguls and before, the use of woollens and, for the poorer classes, blankets was much more general than now.

By about the nineteenth century, as Buchmann's survey shows, "the supply of milk, oil, sugar, vegetables, pulses, salt and other seasoning was more scanty and the people of Bihar and Bengal could not afford the daily use of rice."

Radha Kamal Mukherji has worked out the income of an industrial unskilled worker on the basis of real wages taking base year 1600 at 100. The table speaks volumes for what Britain has achieved in India.

(Index Numbers of Real Wages)

(Base year 1600=100)

Years.		Unskilled workers.	Skilled workers.
1600	..	100	100
1650	..	184.5	123.4
1729	..	62.04	53.5
1807	..	69.8	62.0
1820	..	36.0	24.0
1850	..	52.2	29.5
1870	..	43.1	25.0
1880	..	48.1	25.7
1890	..	36.5	21.9
1901-05	..	43.3	26.5
1911	..	40.1	25.9
1928	..	33.8	25.4
1938	..	49.1	45.3

The wages today, in substance, for an unskilled worker are one-half or one-third, and for a skilled worker one-fourth or one-fifth of what they respectively got in Akbar's days. Under British rule, the Indian worker has to live on one-third or one-fourth of what he lived on before the British came to India.

William Digby estimates in his *Prosperous British India* that the average Indian got 2d. a day in 1850, 1½d. a day in 1880, and only ¼d. a day in 1900.

Within fifty years of the Great Revolt of 1857 an Indian was forced to live on less than one-half of his previous earnings.

Several income estimates have been made in India. The following table will indicate the estimated income per head in rupees:—

Authority		Year.	Estimated income per head (in rupees)
Dadabhoy Naoroji	1867-70	20
Cromer and Barbour	1882	27
William Digby	1898-99	17-8
Lord Curzon	1900	30
Wadia & Joshi	1913-14	44-8
K. T. Shah	1921	67
V. K. R. V. Rao	1931-32	62
Sir James Grigg (1938 Budget speech)	..	1938	56

Some of these estimates have been prepared under the directions of Government and a margin of error of 6 per cent on both sides may be assumed.

But these figures are not proper indications of the income estimates. They must be reduced to a common denomination. For decades the value of purchasing power of the rupee has varied considerably as a result of two factors: First, the fluctuations in the price levels, and Second, the variations in the quantity of money in circulation. In order to make a proper comparison, therefore, the price indices must be taken into account and the real income of the respective years should be calculated. The results are startling:

Year	Price Indices	Real income Rs.
1882	100	27
1901	120	20-4
1921	378	19-6

Thus we have the startling fact that since 1880 there has been in fact a steady decline in the *per capita* income of India.

But again, *per capita* estimates are misleading. They are statistical abstractions and do not give the real picture. For every man who makes an income of over Rs. 62 some one or the other makes an income which is less. Taking India as a whole, therefore, the

bulk of the people do not make anything like Rs. 19.6 per head per year.

This annual *per capita* income may be compared with those of other countries:

U.S.A.	1406
U.K.	980
Germany	603
Japan	218
British India	65

There is again the factor of inequality of income. In 1931-32 the income of British India, classified under the head of Rural and Urban is shown in the following table:

Description.	Total income (in millions of Rs.)	Income per earner (Rs.)	Income per capita. (Rs.)
Rural	12,250	142	51
Urban	4,928	436	166

Inequality of income, therefore, fluctuates very widely in this country. "If we take the urban classes, nearly one-half of their total income belongs to less than one-tenth of their total number. Inequality of income is present in at least equally great measure also among the agricultural classes."

A factual survey of income figures collected from 50 villages revealed a *per capita* income of Rs. 14 per annum. A survey of over 600 villages in C.P. disclosed a *per capita* income of Rs. 12 per annum.

So that for a large mass of people inhabiting countryside, a *per capita* income estimate of Rs. 12 to 20 would be in accord with facts.

The annual *per capita* income of U.K. was estimated in 1930 at £76. In India £5 would be a very liberal figure.

There has been no improvement in the last decade. The population of India has grown to 400 millions. The

total national income has also increased in figures. But the *per capita* income today is the same as it was in the thirties. The money income average today may come upto over Rs. 150/- but if it is corrected to the price level of 1931-32, the average income cannot possibly be higher than the income in 1931-32. For, prices today, as I have pointed out, have almost trebled since 1931-32, particularly during the war years. The currency inflation is indicated by a rise in the total notes from 181 crores on 1-9-1939 to 1,182 crores on 1st February 1946.

During the last 11 years, therefore, poverty has not been reduced to any significant level.

The delegation of the British Trade Union Congress to India in 1928 made the following observations:

"The vast majority of workers in India do not receive more than about 1 sh. a day. In the province of Bengal which includes the large mass of industrial workers, investigations declared that as far as they could ascertain 60 per cent of the workers were in receipt of wages of not more than one shilling per day in the highest instance, scaling down to 7d. for men and 3d. in the case of women and children. Upon these miserable pittance the workers are expected to keep body and soul together and labour throughout the whole working day (often in a vitiated atmosphere and under the most irksome conditions) which on the average cannot be less than one of ten hours."

We have now less of everything than we want normally.

We have today only 75 per cent of the food, 35 per cent of the milk, 25 per cent of housing

space, 20 per cent of the doctors that India's population needs at the minimum.

Expert medical opinion has steadily condemned the disquieting condition in which poverty under British Rule is facing India's life. Sir John Magaw, former Director General, Indian Medical Service, states:

"All the available evidence goes to show that the average duration of life in India is about half of what it might be and that this abbreviated existence is lived at a very low level of health and comfort. There is some difference of opinion as to whether, during the past 50 years, the conditions of life have improved or deteriorated; but, even if some slight improvement may have taken place, the existing conditions of life and state of affairs are so profoundly unsatisfactory that they demand investigation and redress. Even more disquieting is the forecast for the future....There is a prospect of a steady deterioration in the state of nutrition of the people."

EVERYTHING EXCEPT SELF-RULE

This shows what British trusteeship has reduced India to. And what an India! Next to U.S.A. it is the biggest producer of farm products. Its annual estimated production of cotton is six million bales of 400 lbs. each. She has a monopoly of jute; she produces nine million bales a year. She has abundant supplies of wool. She is the largest producer of oil seeds, tobacco, sugar, hides and skins too. She claims 1/3 of the world's cattle population. Her forests equal to 1/5 of the total cultivated area and supply 100 million tons of wood a year besides valuable commodities like lac.

Though her annual coal production is only 26 million metric tons, the resources are estimated at about 55 million tons. India has the largest reserve of iron ore of the rich variety; 3,600 million tons of ore are available. She has the biggest reserves of manganese ore and three-fourths world's mica supplies. She is the world's biggest supply source of ilmenite, monazite, and sircon.

The recent discoveries in Baluchistan show that she has a large reserve of sulphur. Her power resources approximate 25 million kilowatt. Next to China she produces the largest supply of tea. The vast Indo-Gangetic plain is one rich, extensive alluvial tract most suited to intensive farming for food products. Its depth exceeds 1,600 feet below surface.

India's human resources are illimitable. Though numerically we are less than the Chinese, we are more compact, better organised, of a richer efficiency. "A nation's true wealth lies not in its lands and waters, not in its forests and mines, not in its flocks and herds, not in its dollars, but in its healthy and happy men, women and children" (Whipple).

India has everything except self-rule, and her millions of men, women and children are unhealthy and undernourished. Their lives are blighted by a constant fear. Five giants, as Sir William Beveridge called them, Want, Ignorance, Disease, Squalor, Idleness, have the Indian masses, in their grip more than the people of any other land.

AGRICULTURE IN RUINS

India has been the classic land of bumper crops in the past. If Britain destroyed the Indian industry, she has equally ruined the vitality and resilience of our agricultural economy.

Millions and millions of rupees have been wasted on foreign wars. Nothing, however, has been done to organise this great national industry on which India's millions live. If year before the last, millions died of famine in Bengal, if today there is a prospect of a terrible famine ahead, it is because of the criminal neglect of our agricultural economy.

The total area of British India is 1005 million acres. In 1937-38, out of this total 281 million acres only were sown with crops. Another 110 million acres were cultivable waste and 58 million acres were fallow land.

If we take all India figures 360 million crores were sown; cultivable waste represent 170 million crores, and fallow land another 80 million acres.

DECLINING ACREAGE

In British India only a meagre 0.86 acre of land per head is cultivated. There again is the fact that *per capita* acreage is declining. Despite the increase in the total area cultivated, the rate of increase in population has reduced the area of cultivated land per

head of population dependent on agriculture. The position is dangerous.

Even as things are there is no occupational equilibrium. And this lack of balance is growing worse:

Year	1901	1911	1931	1941	Variation in period.	Per cent increase
Acreage per head engaged	1.28	1.24	1.21	1.0		
Total popula- tion (Millions)	1881	1921	1931	1941	1881-1941	
Urban ,,"	250.2	305.5	338.2	388.8	Plus	138.6
Rural ,,"	23.0	31.3	37.5	49.6	,,	26.6
	227.2	274.2	300.7	339.2	,,	112.0

Between 1881 and 1941, therefore, there has been 55.8 per cent increase in the total population and only 50 per cent in the rural population. The acreage per person engaged in agriculture, therefore, has come down from 1.28 to 1. It is easy to lay the blame on increasing population. But would any government in these days of scientific treatment of agriculture be forgiven if it did not provide new sources of satisfying the needs of the increasing population?

Agriculture and animal husbandry all the world over are the inseverable parts of a single industry. The situation as regards the country's cattle is still worse.

Out of a total world stock of 700 million cattle, India possesses about 190 million. Of the world stock, about 125 million are superfluous and uneconomical.

Taking the provincial figures of cattle per 100 acres the figures for the different provinces are as follows:

Bengal	100
U. P.	90
Madras	73
Punjab	58
Bombay	35
Bihar & Orissa	83

In each case more than 25 per 100 acres are superfluous and uneconomical. The average comes to 67 cattle per 100 acres to sown area against 15 for China and 6 for Japan. But in fact there are only 60 million working cattle for about 300 million acres, a number hopelessly inadequate for intensive farming.

Dr. Burns has made certain eloquent estimates to show why cattle in India are growing uneconomical. The total number of bovine adults in India is 167 million. The minimum feed requirements of cattle in India are about 225 million tons of roughages and 17 million tons of concentrates. As against this minimum, the total feed available is only 175 million tons of roughages and less than 4 million tons of concentrates. Therefore there is a clear deficiency of 50 million tons of roughages and 13 million tons of concentrates. When the cattle all over the world are improving, in India, under the guidance of Britain, they are deteriorating.

It must not be forgotten that India largely lives on milk and milk products. The cow is not merely an appendage of agriculture. She is really the mother of the race. What has the British Government done to maintain her capacity and yield?

The average yield of an Indian cow is a little over 2 lbs. a day. In Holland it is 20 lbs. a day, in U.K. it is 15 lbs. a day, in New Zealand 14 lbs. a day. In the pre-war period, Germany, under a government which is held up to the hatred of the whole world, had so looked after its cattle that it produced the same quan-

tity of milk with 25 million cattle which we have with our 200 millions. She had seen to it that every cow in Germany was equal to 8 cows in India.

When the whole world is spending public money on the improvement of agriculture and cattle what did the British Government do? Money had to be spent on imperial wars, not for the initial needs of the country.

What is more, the increase has been very little since 1900. The position in 1937 was as follows:

	Total Budget	Allotted to Livestock Improvement.
Agricultural Dept.	1.13 crores.	.07 crores.
Veterinary Dept.	.47 crores.	.47 crores.

Out of a total budget of 1.6 crores therefore for the Agricultural Department and the Veterinary Department .54 lakhs are being spent for the improvement of livestocks. What generosity and what foresight! Science may have advanced elsewhere. Not in India, thanks to the British.

VILLAGE ECONOMY UNDERMINED

The Indian village economy prior to 1850 was self-contained. The money lenders and the agriculturists were mutually accommodating and helpful. British Rule destroyed the village economy. Naturally rural indebtedness began to weigh down the farmers in an increasing measure. The following table would show the increase in total indebtedness:

Year.	Total Indebtedness.
1875	Rs. 371 per occupant.
1895	„ 45 crores (total)
1911	„ 300 crores.
1925	„ 600 „
1928	„ 900 „
1935	„ 1200 „
1937	„ 1800 „
1939	„ 1200 „

P. J. Thomas puts 1200 crores as rather a low figure. He thinks that the burden must be about 2000 crores as there was a fall in prices of 50 per cent between 1929 and 1934.

As a result of the gross neglect of village economy the number of the landless is on the increase. In 1921 the landless labourers formed 1/5 of those engaged in agriculture. In 1931 the proportion was 1/3. It has increased considerably since then as the following figures show:

Number of landless labourers.		
	(in millions)	
	1882	1921
	7.5	21.7
		33.5

The process of driving the farmer out of his land is continuing unchecked. Only a third of the land belongs to those who actually cultivate it. On the other hand in France 60 per cent of the cultivators own land, in Switzerland 80 per cent, in Germany 88 per cent.

As against this the percentage of population dependent on agriculture is increasing, as the following table will show:—

1891	..	61.1%
1901	..	65.5%
1911	..	72.2%
1921	..	73%
1931	..	75%

DECREASING FERTILITY

Britain, of course, or rather its agent in India, has not raised his little finger to stop the progressive deterioration of soil-fertility. In old days there were traditional methods of restoring fertility to the land in order to make up for what was taken away from it year after year. These methods were neglected; no one taught modern methods to us. The British Govern-

ment did nothing to arrest this downward progress. It was only concerned with drawing more revenue, in maintaining law and order and incurring war expenditure.

The Royal Commission on Agriculture came to the conclusion that a stabilised condition is reached and a low but permanent standard of fertility is established. It was an euphemistic way of stating that the soil is so deteriorated that it cannot deteriorate any further.

The deterioration of the soil in India can be judged from the comparative figures of the average yield of wheat per acre in U.P.

<i>Period.</i>		<i>Yield in lbs.</i>
1600	..	1555
1827-40	..	1000 (irrigated) 620 (non-irrigated)
1917-21	..	1200 (irrigated) 840 (non-irrigated)
1931	..	1000 (irrigated) 900 (non-irrigated)

What a record for a modern civilised government!

A comparative estimate of the area and yield of principal crops in India for 1940-41 would show the deterioration at a glance:

(In lbs. per acre)			
RICE			
	1931-32	1940-41	Decrease.
Bengal	..	961	652
Bihar	..	912	519
C. P.	..	718	419

WHEAT			
	1931-32	1940-41	Decrease.
Bombay	..	430	385
Bengal	..	525	451
C. P.	..	429	397

SUGARCANE

		1931-32	1940-41	Decrease.
Bombay	..	6071	5782	289
Delhi	..	3135	2531	604
U. P.	..	1493	1096	397

What the civilised Governments in other parts of the world did for the land and what has been left undone by foreign rule in India will appear from the comparative statistics of crop yield per acre in India and abroad.

(In lbs. per acre)

Country.	Wheat.	Rice.	Maize.	Sugarcane.	Cotton.	Tobacco.
Egypt	..	1918	2998	1891	70,302	535
Germany	..	2017	2828	113,570 (Java) ..	2127
Japan	..	1783	3444	1392	47,534	196
U. S. A.	..	1813	2185	1579	43,270	268
China	..	968	2433	1284	204
Italy	..	1382	4508	2079	170
India	..	660	1240	803	34,944	89
						987

Who is responsible for this criminal neglect which has resulted in our food deficiency?

Most of the land in India is still left exposed to the vagaries of the monsoon. Only 23 per cent of the total area sown is irrigated. In the Indian States it is still less, only 16 per cent, i.e., 11 million out of 68 million acres. Since the Irrigation Committee's Report of 1901 the progress in Irrigation has been little. The progress, or the lack of it, made during the last 45 years appears from the following figures:—

(British India)

Year.	Crop area cultivated.	Total irrigated area.	% of irrigated area to sown area.
(Millions of acres)			
1902-03	..	224.4	44.1
1939-40	..	244.0	54.9

In 38 years the total irrigated area rose by 10 per cent. The percentage of irrigated to the sown area rose by 3 per cent.

DIMINISHING FOOD SUPPLY

The British officer at one time claimed to be the *Mabaap* of the poor people of India. We have only to look at the result of the *Mabaap* rule to see what it has done. In 1911 the area sown *per capita* in British India was 0.9. By 1941 it had declined to 0.72 acre, by so much as 20 per cent. The decline has been increasingly rapid. It has been .02 acre *per capita* between 1911 and 1921, 0.06 acre *per capita* between 1921-31, and 0.1 *per capita* between 1931-1941. We are going down the incline.

Today we are faced with a terrible famine. Who is responsible for it?

In 1800, on the authority of British experts, surplus was available to the farmers and others as reserves of grain against draught. But a blind disregard of the vital need for providing regular food supply has characterised the British Government from the beginning.

According to the Warren Hastings Report, the famine of 1770 swept away at least one-third of the inhabitants.

<i>Period.</i>	<i>No. of Famines.</i>	<i>Estimated mortality.</i>
1775-1800	..	3
1800-1825	..	5
1825-1850	..	2
1850-1900	..	24
1942-43	..	Bengal Famine

In 1878 the Famine Commission censured the Government of Bengal and the Revenue Board for failing to take notice of the signs of famine in time. But the

British Rulers were Bourbons. They forgot nothing; they learnt nothing.

In the result famine has been taking a toll of human lives in India by millions on a progressive scale.

THE BENGAL FAMINE

In 1943 the same tragic story happened in Bengal. Men died by millions. The British officer never thinks of the calamity that is coming.

The story of the Bengal famine is too recent to need recapitulation. The Bengal famine cost India $1\frac{1}{2}$ million lives according to official estimates. The Anthropological Department of the Calcutta University estimated the number at about $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions. Recently, Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, speaking before the United Nations Food Organisation, referred to the unofficial estimate as 3 millions. And little, if anything, was done to alleviate the distress on an organised scale by the Central or the Provincial Government, nor the highly placed criminals who were responsible for this catastrophe brought to book. The Woodhead Committee Report (1945) states: "We find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that in 1880 the whole food situation was in certain respects more favourable than the situation with which we are faced today."

What a tribute to the progress under British rule from 1880 to 1945!

VIII

DEPLETION OF VITAL NECESSITIES

Since 1900 there has been an increasing food deficit in relation to the increase in population. Equally there has been a deterioration in the quality of foodgrains.

DECLINE IN FOOD NECESSITIES

In spite of this writing on the wall, the Government simply refuses to take serious notice of the fact that the total quantity of foodgrains in India is declining. But it is no use condemning the Britain's agricultural policy in India. The fact is they have none worth the name. Attention, if at all, is always paid to the improvement of commercial crop yields rather than of food crops.

Year.	Population.	Sown area.	British India		Rice. (in million tons.)
			Total food grains. (in million tons.)		
1911-12	.. 281.6 m.	150.6 m. acres.		28.2
1921-22	.. 283.6 „	158.6 „	54.3		27.8
1931-32	.. 256.8 „	156.9 „	50.1		27.4
1941-42	.. 295.8 „	156.5 „	45.7		24.3

While the yield of rice per acre in other parts of the world is on the increase, in India, the yield is decreasing.

Year.	1909-13	1926-27	1931-32	1936-37	1938-39
		1930-31	1935-36		
Japan	.. 1000	1333	1413	1505	1469
America	.. 1827	2124	2053	2339	2276
India	.. 982	851	829	861	728

The gross neglect of the Government becomes patent when the yields in other lands are compared with India's.

		(lbs. per acre.)				
	<i>India.</i>	<i>China.</i>	<i>Japan.</i>	<i>U.S.A.</i>	<i>World Yield.</i>	
Rice	..	988	2433	3070	1680	1440
Wheat	..	811	989	1350	990	840

Wheat production per hectare (in quintale).

<i>India</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>U. K.</i>
7	22.6	20.6

Rice production per hectare.

<i>India.</i>	<i>U.S.A.</i>	<i>China.</i>	<i>Italy.</i>
13.9	24.5	25.1	51.2

With this low production it is not surprising that there is deficiency in food in this country.

1936-37 Average yield per acre in British India in lbs.

<i>Rice.</i>	<i>Wheat.</i>	<i>Barley.</i>	<i>Juar.</i>	<i>Maize.</i>	<i>Gram.</i>	<i>Linseed.</i>
939	774	872	575	939	685	345
	Sugarcane		..	361		
	Cotton		..	127		

India had only about 40 million tons out of the necessary total food supply of 60 million tons. In 1941-42 rice production was only 25.6 million tons. In fact it was less than the 1929-38 average of 30.8 million tons by about 5 million tons. Imports cut off by the war were 2.4 million tons. Thus there was the total deficit of 7.5 million tons. Net wheat deficit was 0.5 million ton. In 1942, therefore, there was no Indian food supply for about 63 million people.

The total production of pulses in India is 8.5 million tons. Of this 7.5 million tons only are available for consumption. As against this our total minimum

requirements are 9.4 million tons. There is, therefore, a clear deficit of 2 million tons.

Assuming that the daily average caloric requirement of the Indian is 2800 calories, 48 million average men have no food, or there is an average deficit of 423 calories in each man's food! At the Hot Springs Conference, the British representative admitted that one-third of the Indian people are habitually underfed in normal times on account of 10 to 20 million tons of shortage in cereals.

In 1937-38 it was found that a deficit of 15 per cent in food supply was diminished further by 7 per cent since 1910-15—"a striking deterioration in recent years but which left the Government unshaken out of its criminal indifference."

ARRESTED DEVELOPMENT

The stupid man blames fate for his mishaps. The British administration in India blames the growing population. But Kate L. Mitchell says: "It is true that the present production of food is wholly inadequate.. . But....there is every reason to believe that by making full use of her resources, India can support a far larger population than at present. The cause of Indian poverty is not the rate of population growth but the fact that India is a case of arrested economic development."

Every civilised Government has a food drive, but the British Government has never attempted any.

During the war years, Great Britain began a vigorous food drive. In 1939 U.K. produced only 40 per cent of her food requirements. In 1942 it was 60 per cent self-sufficient; In 1943, nearly 75 per cent. The British Exchequer granted alluring subsidy of £200

millions a year. After the cessation of the World War II the present Government raised it to £300 millions.

Dr. Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the Exchequer, moving his first post-war budget stated with reference to the subsidy that he had decided to hold the present cost of living steady until further notice even if this meant an increase in the subsidies. He believed that in the near future price stabilisation would be even more important than during the war. These subsidies had been and were mostly a timely grant-in-aid to every household budget in the land and helped to restrain any disproportionate increase in the wage rates which might have disturbed the whole balance of Britain's economic life and sucked her into the fatal whirlpool of inflation.

In India it is the other way about. The proportion of land under food crop is growing less. The touring officers are more concerned with pay, pension and leave and their henchmen busy acquiring titles for war work. What results can follow a soulless administration?

In 1913-14, 81.9 per cent of the area was under food crops. In 1940-41 the proportion was 80 per cent.

Year.	Index numbers showing increase in area.		
	<i>Food.</i>	<i>non-food.</i>	<i>Cotton & Jute.</i>
1913-14	..	100	100
1927-28	..	101	107
1940-41	..	104	119
			153

Area in millions of acres.

Year.	<i>Food crops.</i>	<i>Non-food.</i>	<i>Cotton & Jute.</i>
1913-14	..	190	42
1927-28	..	192	45
1940-41	..	198	50
			29

INADEQUATE AND ILL-BALANCED DIET

The average Indian's diet is inadequate and ill-balanced. "Normal nutrition and health cannot be maintained on many of the diets now used by millions of the people of India," according to Sir Robert McCarrison. If the consumption standard of countries are compared it will clearly show how the Indian lacks the necessities of life.

	Clothing	
	<i>Yd. per yr.</i>	<i>Shoes (pairs) per year.</i>
U. S. A.	..	64 3.87
Germany	..	34 2.08
Japan	..	21.4 ..
India	..	16.1 0.09
World	..	42.0

	Food	
		<i>Calories.</i>
German workman	..	3055
American	..	3500
English	..	3400
Indian peasant	..	2400
Cawnpore Labourer	..	1900
Women in cottage industry		1200

So there we are. Compared to an American workman an Indian workman has half the food, one-fourth the clothing and less than one-half of a shoe to wear!

Milk supply is hopelessly inadequate. Our *per capita* milk production according to Dr. Wright, is not more than 7 oz. per day. Dr. Aykroyd's estimate is 5 oz. This production is against the average minimum consumption which should be **one pound** per individual.

In this land of milk and honey, Indians have no milk worth the name. The following table will show the difference between what other governments have done and what the Government of India has left undone.

<i>Country.</i>	<i>Daily production per head of population</i>	<i>Daily consumption per head of population</i>
	(in oz.)	(in oz.)
New Zealand ..	244	56
Sweden ..	69	61
U. S. A. ..	37	35
Great Britain ..	14	39
India ..	8	7

In most provinces, however, *per capita* consumption is less than 2 oz. a day. The highest consumption is in the Punjab, 9-9 oz. It is less than 2.62 in 4 provinces including Madras and Bengal.

Our total production of milk is 6200 lakhs of maunds (22 million tons) of which about 19 million tons is available for consumption. This works out at 4½ to 5 oz. a day per head. Of this hardly 30 per cent or less than 2 oz. is taken in liquid form. The rest is used for ghee, *dahi*, etc.

According to the estimates of Dr. Wright the total production of milk in India is 690 million maunds. Of this 215 million maunds are consumed as liquid milk (31.2 per cent), and the rest, 475 million maunds (69.8 per cent) is utilised for the making of ghee (364 million maunds) khoa, curds, etc. The United Nations Food and Nutrition Conference recommends that an individual should drink at least 21 ozs per day. An Indian, however, under British rule is condemned to only 2 oz per day.

A study of the influence of income level on milk consumption also shows the terrible plight of India in relation to this essential source of nutrition.

Values per family* per month.

<i>Income group.</i>	<i>Consumption of milk.</i>	<i>Expenditure on milk.</i>	<i>Expenditure on ghee.</i>
Rs. 30 ..	1 lb.	0-8-1	0-4-6
Rs. 50-60 ..	4 lbs.	0-14-6	0-9-8
All incomes ..	3.9 lbs.	0-13-9	0-9-11

* Average size of the family 4 to 8.

Sugar is another food essential. India is the largest producer of sugar cane in the world. But we are the smallest consumer. A Britisher consumes 112 lbs of sugar per year, an American 103 lbs, a Japanese 29 lbs, an Indian only 20 lbs. per year inclusive of gur. Our total production of sugar, refined and unrefined, is 5.3 million tons.

An overall picture will still better illustrate the position of food supply in British India.

Yield of food (in million tons.)				
	Rice.	Wheat.	All food grains and pulses.	(1931) Population.
1929-30	..	25.5	8.9	49.1 256.9 mn.
1939-40	..	24.6	8.9	47.2 295.8 ,,
% of increase or decrease	..	-3.7	..	-3.9 +15.2

While population increases, food supply decreases.

The area under grains and pulses has been on the increase but the quantity of foodgrains and pulses per head has decreased.

Area under Grains (million acres.)				
Year.	Rice.	Wheat.	All.	
1929-30	..	66.5	24.7	155.9
1939-40	..	70.1	26.1	158.2
% of increase	..	+5.6	+5.5	+1.5

WORSE THAN CONVICTS

A comparative study of the daily consumption of food per adult male in the homes of free industrial workers and in prisons in Bombay will show that the consumption standard of an industrial worker in Bombay is lower than that of convicts in jail.

Industrial workers' Textile. *Convicts in Bombay prisons*
 (in lbs.)

	<i>Bombay</i>	<i>Madras.</i>	<i>Light Labour. Hard Labour</i>	
Cereals	..	1.29	1.13	1.38
Pulse	..	.09	.07	.21
Meat	..	.0304
Salt	..	.04	.05	.03
Oils	..	.02	.03	.03
Food adjunct		.07	.09
		1.54	1.87	1.69
				1.87

Who said India is a jail? It is worse.

The Imperial Council of Agricultural Research in its Memorandum published in 1944 estimated the percentage increase in the production of various foods necessary for providing a suitably balanced diet in minimum quantity for all.

Cereals	..	10%
Pulses	..	20%
Fats and Oils	..	250%
Fruits	..	50%
Vegetables	..	100%
Milk	..	300%
Fish and Egg	..	300%

IX

THE POPULATION MYTH

The problem of our population has also to be considered. 73 per cent of the population, directly depends upon agriculture; a further 10 per cent indirectly. Since the 17th century, when approximate figures are available, there has been a rapid increase in India's population.

1700	100 millions.
1750	130 "
1850	150 "
1881	254 "
1931	353 "
1941	388 "

It is a fallacy to attribute our difficulties to the growth of our population. It is in the first instance incorrect to say as some British authorities do, that the rate of population growth has been the highest in India.

Percentage increase of population in India

1871-81	..	1.5
1881-91	..	9.6
1891-1901	..	1.4
1901-1911	..	6.4
1911-1921	..	1.2
1921-31	..	10.6
1931-41	..	15.0

Between 1870 and 1930, therefore, the population increase was 30.7 per cent. Other peoples in the world are multiplying much faster. Europe exclud-

ing Russia in the same period has grown by 64 per cent; Germany by 60; Italy by 60; Japan by 113; U.K. by 77. Russia has increased by 115 per cent. It has been estimated that since the year 1650 the population of the White races has increased from 100 millions to 750 millions (1930). If Moreland's estimate of India's population in 1606 at the time of Akbar's death is accepted, the increase of population in India in about the same period is less than half the increase of the Europeans.

Dr. Kingsley Davis says: "The population increased about 54 per cent during the period from 1872 to 1941." The U.K. during the same period increased by 56 per cent and if we take the seventy year period from 1821 to 1891 (perhaps more compatible with India's last 70 years) we find the increase by 81 per cent. Similarly Japan, during 70 years from 1873 to 1942, experienced a growth of approximately 136 per cent. This leaves out of account the migrations to other lands. Compared to many other countries India's population has not increased with much rapidity.

Any other dutiful Government would have encouraged industrial development of the country to meet the growing demand of the population. But not the British Government of India, which has acted throughout in the interests of British industry. This is established by two facts. First, the industrial population as compared to other countries is very small, and Second, even the percentage of that population is falling.

There are hardly 4½ million men in large-scale organised industries. The percentage of workers in industries has declined from 11.27 in 1911 to 9.27 in 1931 and in trade from 5.7 to 5.4. Even the proportion

of industrial workers to rural population has steadily decreased.

<i>Year.</i>		<i>% of population dependent on agriculture.</i>	<i>% of population engaged in industry.</i>
1891	..	61.1
1911	..	66.5	5.5
1921	..	72.2	4.9
1931	..	73.0	4.3
1941	..	74.0	4.2

India is not over-populated. It is over-populated only in the sense, as Car Saunders puts it, that "There are too many people in relation to the whole set of facts." The British Government's acts of omission and commission are responsible for the result.

OVER-BURDENED LAND

The rural-urban ratio in population has remained almost the same.

<i>Census year.</i>		<i>Rural.</i>	<i>Urban.</i>
1872	..	91.28	8.72
1881	..	90.59	9.41
1891	..	90.54	9.46
1901	..	90.65	9.35
1911	..	90.65	9.35
1921	..	89.70	10.30
1931	..	89.00	11.00

These facts show that people prefer to over-burden the land as there is no scope for the industrial worker.

And the land thus over-burdened is deteriorating for want of governmental effort to increase the agricultural yield.

The proportion of working population to persons engaged in industries will also prove the hopelessness on the situation.

	1911	1921	1931	1941	1911-41 %variation
(a) Population (mn) ..	315	319	353	389	+23.5
(b) Working Population ..	149	146	154	170	+13.4
(c) Persons engaged in industries ..	17.5	15.7	15.3	16.3	- 6.3
Percentage of c to b	11.0	11.0	10.0	9.6	-12.7
Percentage of c to a	5.5	4.9	4.3	4.2	-23.6

The number of workers in large-scale industries are increasing but very slowly.

Year.	(In lakhs)				Total.
	Mines.	Factories.	Plantations.	Railways.	
1901 ..	0.88	4.70	6.38	3.70	15.66
1911 ..	3.07	7.90	7.41	5.43	23.12
1921 ..	3.55	12.30	10.02	7.49	31.19
1931 ..	3.45	15.20	10.80	7.37	35.81

The total number of people dependent on industries has steadily decreased.

	(in millions)	
1901	34.3
1911	34.2
1921	33.2
1931	32.9 (Census Report)

A comparative study of distribution of population in occupations in other countries would show how India has been kept back from progressing towards industrial development.

Percentage of working population engaged in occupations.

(1931)	<i>Agriculture, Industry fishing, & mining. etc.</i>	<i>Trade & transport.</i>	<i>Liberal professions.</i>	<i>Others.</i>
U. K.	.. 7.0	47.3	20.7	4.4 20.6
U. S. A.	.. 22.0	31.7	24.5	7.0 14.8
Japan	.. 50.3	19.5	20.2	.. 10.0
India	.. 67.2	10.2	6.6	1.5 14.5

The *per capita* production of goods vital to industrial progress are as follows:

	<i>U.S.A.</i>	<i>U.K.</i> (Per ton)	<i>India</i>
Iron	.. .005	.2	.3
Steel	.. .003	.3	.4
Coal	.. .007	5.2	3.0

U.S.S.R. WITH SELF-RULE

'And if one compares with what U.S.S.R. has been able to do, the difference is remarkable.

The total number of workers and employees in Soviet Industry, trade and agriculture has grown, since 1919, nearly three times, from $11\frac{1}{2}$ million to 32 millions. Women represented 45 per cent of all industrial workers in November 1940. The urban population has increased from 26.3 millions in 1926 to 55.9 millions in 1939.

In U.S.S.R. the 1939 census reveals that, of a total population of 170 millions, workmen in towns and villages (including family members) were 55 millions or 32.2 per cent. Non-working population was hardly 0.04 per cent. Employees formed only 17.54 per cent.

Industrial output of U.S.S.R.

(gross figures in milliards of roubles 1926-27 values).

	1913	1933	1939	1941 (plan)
Total	.. 16.2	45.7	123.9	162.0
Capital goods	.. 5.4	24.5	73.7	103.6
Consumer goods	.. 10.8	21.2	50.2	58.4

Total agricultural production

(in millions of roubles of 1926-27 value)

1913	1929	1938
12,607	14,745	20,123

These figures of population disposals have a direct bearing on the output.

No wonder U.S.S.R. evokes universal admiration.

INDIA KEPT 150 YEARS BEHIND

Taking the world as a whole probably about five-sevenths of the working population are engaged in agriculture. In U.S.A. 140 years ago over 80 per cent of the occupied population were agriculturists, while now about 20 per cent supply a more varied and richer dietary and in addition, raw materials like cotton. At the end of the 17th century, in Great Britain, 80 per cent of the population were engaged in agriculture. In 1930 the percentage of farmers was only 6 per cent. So that in occupational distribution we are today where U.K. and the U.S.A. were 150 years back!

But again these calculations are faulty. The government has given no statistics of the millions of unemployed in the country who are either drags on society or live but to die. They will, on a rough calculation, be 20 per cent totally unemployed and 20 per cent partially unemployed. And no one thinks in terms of this colossal wastage of human power, of the will and energy to work.

SHORTAGES ALL ROUND

The country has been kept at the lowest margin of undevelopment, compared to its resources, man-power and intelligence. Whitley Commission on labour says "97 per cent of the working classes in Bombay live in one-room tenements with 6 to 9 persons per room. In Ahmedabad the areas occupied by the working class present pictures of terrible squalor. Nearly 92 per cent of the houses are one-roomed." According

to 1931 Census, there were 4865 persons per 1000 houses. In 1941 the number increased to 5116.

In India, hardly 13 per cent of the population live in towns as compared with 50 per cent in U.S.A., in 1930, and even this little urbanisation had created such congestion that in Bombay City 74 per cent of the people (1931) that is, 8 lakhs lived in 2 lakhs single-roomed tenements that is, 4 to a room. Mr. Sorely tells us in a recent Report that some of the conditions of housing in Bombay City "must be more reminiscent of the Black Hole of historical memory than of any modern city pretending to sanitary living conditions."

Rent Inquiry Committee (Bombay) recently estimated that 74 per cent of the population lives in one-room tenements.

The minimum floor space required per individual is 100 square feet. The Bombay labourer has only 27.5 square feet.

HALF-NAKED INDIA

In the whole year 1945, production of cloth was hardly 4700 million yards; a small fall from 1944 figures. Before the war, mill production was 3800 million yards; hand-loom production 1600 million yards; and imports were 950 million yards; in all 6350 yards. Exports were 150 million yards; so that the net quantity available for home consumption was 6200 million yards. During the war years exports and defence requirements took away 1500 million yards a year. Imports have been practically cut off. The available yardage is less than 4000 million yards or about 10 yards per head. Scant wonder, India has to go about clothless.

A comparative view of the consumption of cotton cloth per head shows an equally sad state:

U. S. A.	64 sq. yds.
U. K.	35 , " ,
Japan	21 linear yds.
India	16 , " , (only 10 or 12 in 43-44)

Per capita consumption of coal in U.S.A. is 4.72 tons: in Great Britain 2.6 tons; in India, however, it is only 0.07 tons.

Railway mileage in India is 41,000 (with a capital investment of Rs. 850 crores) that is, 35 miles per 100 sq. miles against 100 in U.S.A. and 200 in U.K. Still, all broad-gauge locomotives have to be imported and till lately, even wagons. In 1943-45 estimated imports were of 900 locomotives.

It must not be forgotten that the railways in India were constructed not for national development but for military purposes. Some of the major Railway Companies were floated by British businessmen who were guaranteed a certain percentage of profits on their investments. As a result, these railways were worked in a manner so as to result in losses over several decades all of which were made good by the Indian tax-payer.

We have 35 miles of Roads per 100 sq. miles of territory while the corresponding figures of other countries are:—

Japan	300
U. S. A.	200
Great Britain	110

In a total area of 1,580,000 sq. miles there are only 85,792 miles of metalled roads. Of this, total mileage, of roads with cement or bituminous surface is only 9680. The Nagpur Conference of Chief Engineers

of Provinces and States estimated a minimum figure of 400,000 miles of roads to meet our requirements, at least half being "all-weather" roads.

In 1938-39 we had hardly 5 motor trucks for every lakh of population as against 1200 in U.K. and 3300 in U.S.A. In U.S.A. one in every five persons own an automobile; in United Kingdom one in every twenty persons of the population; in India one in every 2000!

If we are one hundred and fifty years behind U.S.A. and U.K. in the general development of our resources, it means no real progress has been made since the British came. Britain came; stopped the clock of progress; and we were kept as we were, seeing the world pass us by.

CHAPTER X

RACE DETERIORATION

Novalis said "There is but one temple in the world, and that temple is the body of man." And this shrine, so far as India is concerned, has been allowed to be desecrated in the British period.

DEATH RATE

The average expectation of life in U.K. and Germany is 63 years, in Japan 47 years, but in India it is only 27 years.

The expectation of life at birth for the average German increased, between 1870 and 1935, from 35 years to 58; that of the average Englishman, from 41 years to 56. In India it was 25.54 in 1891 and was only 26.46 in 1941. The reason is clear. As Sir Robert McCarrison puts it, "Normal nutrition and health cannot be maintained on many of the diets now used by millions of the people of India."

Mean expectation of life in India

		1881	1891	1901	1911	1931
Males	28.67	24.59	23.63	22.59	26.91
Females	25.88	25.54	23.96	23.31	26.56

Nothing has been done to reduce the mortality rate in India which is higher than in any other country.

Birth and Death Rates (per thousand)

	1885-90	1890-01	1901-11	1911-21	1921-31	1931-35
Birth rate ..	36	34	38	37	35	31.35
Death rate ..	26	31	34	34	26	24

Death rate in 1901-10 and in 1911-20 was recorded as 34 per thousand. In 1939 it was 22 per thousand. Infant mortality since 1920 has also fallen from 190 to 160. But the death rate compared to other countries is shocking.

Survivors of 100,000 infants at the end of 50 years.

		U.K.	Japan	India.
Male	59,903	52,629	18,658
Female	64,742	51,794	19,714

This death rate has a close relation to the poverty in the country, as a comparison between the death rate per 1000 of population and income in International Units (I.U.s) per head would show:

Country		(I' Us.) per capita income.	Death rate per 1000
U.S.A.	..	1381	10.9
U.K.	..	1069	12.2
Germany	..	646	11.0
Japan	..	353	18.1
India	..	200	23.8

INFANT MORTALITY

Fifty per cent of the deaths recorded in India in any given year occur in children below ten years of age. The comparative percentage in U.K. is only 12 per cent. Four children die in India to one in U.K.!

The figures for infant mortality in India are a disgrace to any government. They are 48 per thousand in London against 201 per thousand in Bombay, which is one of the healthiest towns in India.

U.K. and U.S.A. have in recent years made rapid strides in reducing infant mortality.

Infant deaths per 1000 live births

		1900-02	1910-12	1920-22	1930-32
New York	..	130	110	80	55
United Kingdom	..	150	110	80	60

	Expectation of life				
	New Zealand.	Australia.	U. K. & Germany	Japan	India
Years	..	67	63	63	47
					27

Comparative Vital statistics for 1937

(Rate per 1000 of population)

Country	Death rate.	Birthrate.	Infant mortality
India	22.4	34.5
Australia	9.4	17.0
U.S.A.	11.2	17.0
U. K.	12.4	14.9
Japan	17.0	80.6
			162
			38
			54
			58
			106

Rate of infant mortality per thousand for three quinquennia from 1921 would indicate that while in every other country the rate of infant mortality is not only low, but is declining rapidly, in India the rate is high and remains almost constant.

Country.	1921-25	1926-30	1931-35.
U. K.	78	70
Sweden	60	58
Norway	52	49
Germany	122	94
U.S.A.	74	68
India	182	178
			65
			51
			47
			76
			59
			171

In Great Britain for instance the mortality for children between the ages of one and five years fell from 4.59 per 1000 living in 1939 to 3.34 in 1943.

MATERNAL MORTALITY

Another distressing element is the high death rate among women during the reproduction period between the ages of 15 and 45 years. Estimates of maternal mortality in different parts of the country range from 16 to 24 per 1000 births. Highest maternal mortality rate, 24 per thousand, was estimated by Sir John Megaw in 1933. The estimate of 20 deaths to 1000 live births is made by the Central Advisory Board of Health Special Committee (1937).

Sir John Megaw's estimates show a total of maternal death rate per year at 200,000.

This state of things may be compared with the maternal mortality rate in other countries.

U.K.	2.6	per thousand births
Holland	2.4	"
France	2.5	"
Sweden	2.6	"
Denmark	2.7	"
Italy	2.9	"
Japan	3.0	"
Switzerland	4.5	"
New Zealand	4.7	"

The maternal mortality rate per 1000 total births fell in U.K. from 3.10 in 1939 to 2.30 in 1943. Ten mothers die in India as compared to one in U.K.!

There is no greater condemnation of British rule than the fact that India neither has nor had an adequate benefit of the progress in medical sciences. "India almost lacks effective social or economic measures for the maintenance of health." In 1912 more people died in India due to influenza than the total of all persons who died in first World War. In 1918-19 again one crore and forty lakhs of human beings died of influenza in India.

Sir John Megaw says "In India 13 million people suffer from venereal diseases, 2 million from tuberculosis, 6 million are victims of night blindness due to bad diet, 6 million are totally blind, 2 million have rickets due to deficiency in diet.

IN TIPPU'S TIMES

Look upon this picture of British rule and upon that of pre-British days.

Anqetil du Perron speaking about Maharashtra says: "When I entered the country of the Maharattas,

I thought myself in the midst of simplicity and happiness of the golden age....misery was unknown....the people were cheerful, vigorous and in high health." Lt. Col. Moore (a traveller) testifies to conditions in the eighteenth century, "When a person travelling through a strange country finds it well cultivated, populous, with industrious inhabitants, cities well founded, commerce extending, towns increasing and everything flourishing so as to indicate happiness, he naturally concludes the form of government congenial to the people". This is a picture of Tippu's government.

PREVENTIBLE DISEASES

And now disease reigns supreme

Mortality per 100,000 (1935-37 averages) 'Health of India'				
	Calcutta	Bombay	New York	London
T.B.	270	170	47	87
Dysentery, etc. ..	436 (Madras)	252	nil	nil
Typhoid	90	40	0.2	0.4

Comparison with other Asiatic colonial countries.

	Br. India	Burma	Japan.	Philippines	Indo- China	Dutch East Indies.
Small-pox ..	24.4	9	0.02	0	2	0
Cholera ..	46.2	26	0	.01	13	2

The toll of malaria in India would have shaken any government out of its self-complacence, but not the British. It directly causes every year no less than one million deaths.

Over 10 crores suffer every year from malaria. Lt. Col. J. A. Sinton, the late Director, Malaria Survey of India says: "Malaria gives rise to the greatest economic problem....financial losses not less than Rs. 11,000 lakhs....While it is not possible to evaluate with any degree of accuracy the immensity of these direct and indirect losses, there is little reason

to doubt that they must run into unbelievable millions of sterling each year." If a 100 million suffer every year from malaria, about 25 to 75 millions more suffer from morbidity due to malaria.

"In Bengal, in 1937, over 60 per cent of the population suffered from malaria and about 1000 died every day of the year." Major Norman White stated before the Industrial Commission of 1918 that "malaria, hookworm, and tuberculosis are the most potent causes of industrial inefficiency." Conditions have scarcely improved since then. Total deaths from malaria in 1901-1921 numbered 18.5 million. What a commentary on the country's administration that the positive checks mentioned by Malthus on population growth should actually be operative in India!

The remarks of the Famine Inquiry Commission are significant. "The possibility may also be mentioned that average height and weight have fallen as a result of deterioration in diet; that is, there has been a process of physical adaptation to a decreasing *per capita* food supply.

"Existing standard of nutrition are thoroughly unsatisfactory. The population is indeed being fed, but fed at a low level. Under-nutrition and mal-nutrition are wide-spread."

It is this inadequate and ill-balanced diet (under-nutrition) that impairs the powers of resistance to infection. Medical service all the world over where self-rule prevails, is not only curative but also preventive. In India there is no positive policy to promote health. And the State remedial services are hopelessly inadequate. Remedial measures if taken are halting and tardy. To take but one instance, the average consumption of quinine is 2 lakhs lbs. against our require-

ments of over 6 lakhs lbs. And the Government has the monopoly of cinchona.

Medical services in India are hopelessly inadequate. The total number of hospitals and dispensaries throughout British India is less than 7,000. Each serves, therefore, on an average 13,000 persons in urban and 53,000 people in rural areas. There are only 226 special women's hospitals. That is, there is only one hospital for 43,000 persons and one bed for 4,000.

There are about 42,000 doctors, of whom two-thirds are licentiatess; one doctor for 50,000 people! This total is less than Japan's whose population is about the same as that of Bengal. If we are to have one doctor per 2,000 of population, India would require 200,000 doctors, that is 5 times the present number.

In U.K., in 1938, there were 3,261 welfare centres and a staff equivalent to the whole time services of 2,900 health visitors for a population of 41 millions. In India, in 1939, for a ten-fold population, there were only 1,020 centres, a mere apology!

The total number of trained nurses in the country is 6,130 and the number of women doctors with special training in maternity and child-welfare work throughout India is less than 50.

In India, the first medical school was opened in 1822. Medical Colleges in Madras and Calcutta were started in 1835. Midwifery training in Madras was started in 1854. And these are the results to date. As against this in Great Britain there were 110,000 nurses and 61,500 doctors, that is, two nurses to each doctor and a doctor for every 775 people.

Scarcely any effective social and economic measures are adopted for the maintenance of health.

A table composed from the memorandum of the Government of C.P. to the Royal Commission on Labour shows the comparative body weight of a spinner in mills and prisoner in jails.

Province.		Average wt. of spinner	Average wt. of a prisoner	Difference
Bombay	..	102.9	112.12	10.3
C. P.	..	100.92	110.45	9.53
Burma	..	117.14	125.70	8.56
U.P.	..	107.01	115.08	8.07
Bengal	..	107.93	115.05	7.12
Punjab	..	113.08	115.05	1.97
Madras	..	113.64	114.38	0.75

Again, India is not a jail, but worse than one.

Modern Governments with a conscience have begun to plan for the welfare of their people from 'womb to the tomb.' The British Government has never applied its mind seriously to any problem except preparing reports on the 'tombs' which its policy, or the want of it, has brought into existence.

THE DESCENT OF DARKNESS

About 1800 before the British took charge of India's education "each village had its own school."

A foreign observer speaking of indigenous village educational institutions remarked about 1830, "my recollections of the village schools of Scotland do not enable me to pronounce that the instruction given in them has a more direct bearing upon the daily interests of life than that which I find given or professed to be given in the humbler village school of Bengal." On the authority of Max Muller, Keir Hardie stated that prior to the coming of the British there were as many as 80,000 schools in Bengal alone, there was one school for every 400 persons, and that in most villages, majority of the people could read and write. Dr. Latiner, Director of Public Instruction in the Punjab, also subscribes to this view.

Macaulay's famous minute on Education was a frank plea for destroying indigenous education, in the interest of British domination. "We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions we govern—a class of persons Indian in blood and colour but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, in intellect."

In 1835 Lord Bentick published a resolution which ran as follows: "His Lordship is of opinion that the great object of the British government ought to be

the promotion of European literature and science amongst the natives of India and therefore all the funds appropriated for the purposes of education would be best employed to English education alone."

Indigenous educational institutions, neglected and shorn of all state support and guidance, withered away and were replaced by the half-hearted, imitative and sterile education of the present day.

And what a fall by 1900!

Lord Curzon stated, "Four villages out of five are without school. Only one girl in 40 attend any school."

In 1813, the magnificent sum of Rs. one lakh was allotted to education in the Central budget and this sum was not fully utilised for a decade! In 1907, only 36 lakhs out of 180 lakhs of boys of school-going age were actually at school; that is, 80 per cent had no schooling whatever. Gokhale's modest demand in 1910 that a beginning should be made in the direction of making elementary education free and compulsory was turned down by British votes. The Compulsory Education Bill was defeated by 31 votes against 13. 1941 census places the percentage of the illiterates at 85 per cent.

"Just going to school" hardly means anything. The Hartog Commission focussed attention on the wastage in our educational system. As an instance, primary schools of Bengal showed a wastage of over 90 per cent.

Only 7 per cent of those who start learning get to class IV. Naturally there is a very slow increase in the number of literates. In this case too there is a race with population growth. Percentage of 'literacy' has

increased from 3: 5 in 1881 to 8 per cent in 1931 and only to 14 per cent in 1941.

On the other hand in 40 years, U.S.A. has raised the percentage of literacy in the Philippines from 2 to 55 per cent. And Russia with its patriotic government has raised literacy from 20 per cent to more than 93 per cent in 20 years. If India only had a government of its own during the last 20 years!

H. V. Hampton of Indian Education Service says: "It is only a slight exaggeration to say that the Indian high school is much the same as it was in 1904 and but little changed from what it was as far back as 1884."

Literacy is very uneven even as it is. Only 120 out of a thousand are now 'literate' in our land. From the point of literacy, Travancore occupied the highest place in India with 47.9 per cent. Cochin comes next with 35.4, Delhi has 25.7 and Baroda 23. Among the provinces, Madras, Bombay and Bengal, have percentages of 13, 19.5 and 16.1 respectively.

NO MONEY FOR EDUCATION

Public expenditure on education is disgracefully low. We spend only Rs. 90 million annually on education, from all sources. On the other hand a very conservative estimate of the total recurring (apart from capital) expenditure on a national primary education alone will be about Rs. 350 million.

Our *per capita* public expenditure at present is less than Rs. 10. In 1938-39, U.K. spent for education Rs. 33-2-0 per head and India only Rs. 0-8-9 per head. We were 66 times worse than United Kingdom from an educational point of view!

The Wood despatch of the Board of Directors over 92 years back stated: "The importance of female edu-

cation in India cannot be over-stated." Yet in 1941, the comment in the Census Report is "Even now, however, the percentage of literacy among women is only 20 per cent." Importance is stressed; costly diagnosis is made; the cure remains as far away as possible.

Technical education is particularly backward. A very small percentage of technically qualified people come from the Universities.

There are now only 17 schools of art, 29 medical schools, about 19 engineering institutions and less than 20 agricultural schools in this vast country.

For a population of 300 million, serving an area of about 1.5 million sq. miles, there are in India 18 Universities (3 of them being in Indian States), with an enrolment of about 120,000. The number of colleges is about 300 including 80 professional colleges. There are only about 3,500 high schools with a total enrolment of 1.2 million students including 1.5 lakhs of girls. 187,000 primary schools cater to the needs of primary education, while there are 678,000 villages in India.

Out of over 40 million children of primary school-going age, hardly 11 million attend school. Of every 100 that so attend, less than 8 reach the eighth standard. In fact, only 5.5 per cent of the entire population is receiving instruction today.

Attention and money are being wasted in learning English, the language of foreign rulers, stifling thought and expression and the indigenous village institutions have faded out of existence in most places.

Number of literates in English per 1000 aged 5 and over All India

Males.	Females.	All persons.
212	27	123

In 1940-41 out of a total expenditure on education of about Rs. 30 crores in British India, Rs. 17½ crores came from public funds. Against this the annual net cost of a national system of education, when in full working order, will amount to Rs. 277 crores. This expenditure is based on pre-war standards in regard to population and cost of living. Of this sum, about 200 crores would be the cost of Basic (Primary and Middle) education.

The Sargent Committee Report maintains with all seriousness....“even if all the funds required were available it would be impossible to give complete effect to the proposals which it contains in a period of less than 40 years.” We are offered the consolation that we may hope to reach where Great Britain, U.S.A., U.S.S.R., and other leading countries stand today as regards education in another 50 years. But by then, they would be far, far ahead of us. So according to Sargent we may hope to reach them—never!

In Great Britain, a White Paper has been recently presented to the Parliament containing proposals for post-war educational expansion. Says the White Paper “upon the education of the people of this country, the fate of this country depends.” Of no other country in the world is this more true than of India. And if Sargent is a true prophet, our fate is sealed, unless British rule ends.

The meagreness of our education can be judged from the enrolment in the Universities in India (1941-42).

No. of students.	All Universi- ties in Br. India.	Universities in Indian States	Total (India)
Intermediate class ..	85,072	8571	93,643
Undergraduate (Arts) ..	32,972	1359	34,331
Undergraduate (Science) ..	10,770	1350	12,120
Post Graduate (Arts) ..	6,085	90	6,175
Post Graduate (Science) ..	1,347	57	1,404
Research Students (Arts) ..	336	22	358
Research Students (Science)	164	20	184
For professional degrees.			
Medicine ..	6531	340	6871
Law ..	7555	311	7866
Engineering ..	2278	441	2719
Education ..	2779	158	2936
Agriculture ..	1194	1194
Commerce ..	6326	164	6490
Total	Males ..	148410	11575
	Females ..	14998	1308
		163.408	12883
			176.291

A Chinese Proverb says:—

“If you are planning for one year, plant grain;
 If you are planning for ten years, plant trees;
 If you are planning for a hundred years, plant men.”

Yes, that is what is needed. If men are to be ‘planted’ firmly, in India, their education, their health, their nourishment, their work should all be of the highest type. Adequate provision for education facilities is the first charge on the country’s resources. The British naturally are not much concerned with this side of our development.

EDUCATION IN RUSSIA

U.S.S.R. is a very big country. It was a backward country like India twenty years ago. But its recent educational achievements might well furnish a standard comparison. Of those living within the

1939 borders of the U.S.S.R. no fewer than 76 per cent were illiterate in 1897. In 1917 over 50 per cent of the males and 80 per cent of the females were illiterate. In 1939 the change was magical. Over 90 per cent of all males and 72 per cent of women were literate despite their multiplicity of minorities and languages.

Literates over 9 years old

Dec. '26	Jan. '39
51.1	81.2

Literates among persons aged over 9 years

		Urban districts.	rural districts.
1926	..	76.3%	45.2%
1939	..	89.5%	76.8%
		Number of High Schools	Students in them
1919	..	91	124,000
1940	..	700	600,000

Number of books printed

	1913	1939	1914	1929	1938	1939	
Libraries	..	86 million.	..	701 million.			
Editions of books and journals	..	12.6	12.6	28.9	70.0	77.6	(in 1000s)
	..	86.7	86.7	568.1	949.0	..	(millions)

In 1928-32 the engineering colleges in U.S.S.R. produced altogether 67,000 "industrial officers." In the 1932-37 five year period, the number of such graduates rose to 211,000. In 1939, no less than 90 per cent of all students were maintained by State bursaries. As late as 1937 about 20 per cent of the whole State expenditure was allocated to education nearly as much as to defence. And no one can say that Russia pays no attention to defence.

U.S.S.R. pays special attention to social insurance.

Expenditure on social insurance.

	(in millions of roubles)			
	1928	1938	1941	(plan)
Theatres ..	1,058	6323	9998	
Beds in hospitals ..	1914	1929	1938	1939
Doctors ..	153	..	702	787
	175.5	246.8	672	(thousands)
	19785	63162	110,000	

U.S.S.R. in twenty years has almost come upto the level of U.K. and U.S.A. India has been doomed to darkness. Why? Because we are not our own masters.

HUNGER AND WHY?

The claim is made that Britain has given peace to India. Has she? If she disarmed us, it was to see that exploitation was not resisted by us. If she introduced law and order, it was to train up a large Indian Police force under British officers whose principal function was to keep India safe for Britain; their protection had, more often than not, to be purchased by the people by bribery on an almost universal scale. Our will to resist, even in self-defence or in defence of our property,— which is considered sacred—has been destroyed.

It is further claimed that Britain gave us modern education. This is scarcely a place to discuss the quality of education which the British has given us. But broadly speaking in Pre-British days, the leaders of society consisted of men devoted to learning, teaching and religious instruction; of men who formed the military aristocracy, small and big; of men who traded or formed the artisan class. The British destroyed the social organisation completely and created by their support only two classes of instruments.

The First class consisted of the British educated who were British instruments for administrative purposes, men who as officers bullied their own people and played flunkies to their foreign masters.

The Second class consisted of a small British created mercantile class standing aloof from their people in the pride of new-gotten wealth which was unknown to the rich of the Pre-British period; the unconscious middlemen of British business who flourished on the leavings which remained in their hands after the bulk of India's wealth passed into British hands.

The man of learning, who stuck to the older education, the martial races, which clung to the old tradition, the artizans who formed the strength of the old cottage industries, and the farmers, the backbone of the society were forced down the scale of life; their skill, vitality and strength were reduced to utter helplessness. Struggle for existence in consequence has been rendered terrific in a land of plenty. The joy and contentment which were ours in pre-British ages has gone.

And that is why there is universal bitterness against Britain, and an equally acute and universal hunger for Swaraj.

But it would be scarcely fair to attribute to Britain a sinister deep laid design to destroy India carried through a century and a half. From 1787 to 1857 was a period of unstinted loot at the hands of the shameless successors of Drake. Since 1857 there was a change. Rapacity gave place to a two-fold process: a pious attempt to raise India and a deter-

mined effort not to slow down the process of enriching Britain. The British public were at the zenith of their Mid-Victorian Liberalism thinking in terms of being the apostles of a new world order. Indian policy was therefore directed towards two objectives:

First, to impose on an ancient and highly complex culture and society which the Britishers considered inferior, the outward semblances of a crude European culture.

Second, to concentrate all political power in the hands of the governing Corporation, the civil service composed of the British and their Indian instruments, who were allowed a free hand only so long as they earned heavy dividends for Britain and did nothing to shock the British conscience.

Third, to carry out imperialistic ambition but never to the edge of a revolutionary precipice.

The British Imperialism may be more humane than others in history; an individual British Civil servant may be a hardworking, honest man; the British public opinion may be at times highly sensitive to democratic ideas. But these factors made very little difference to the steady exploitation of the country and the utter unfitness of the governing corporation to acquire the outlook and energy of a national government.

Britain's was a cold-blooded rule. And no wonder India was bled white. Now that a new era of friendship between India and Britain is dawning India has a right to look forward to Britain helping her to make up for what she has lost under Britain's self-imposed trusteeship.